



Technical Report 2004

Prevalence of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs; Risk and Protective
Factors; Prohibited Behaviors; and Pro-social Behaviors
Among Students in the State of Maine

Prepared by:

**Office of Substance Abuse
Department of Health and Human Services**

In conjunction with:

Pan Atlantic Consultants / SMS Inc.

February 2005

In accordance with federal and state laws, the Maine Office of Substance Abuse, Department of Health and Human Services, does not discriminate on the basis of disability, race, color, creed, gender, age, or national origin in admission or access to treatment, services, or employment in its programs and activities.

This project was supported, in part, by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, the Department of Education, the Department of Justice (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention), and the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, SAMHSA.

This information is available in alternate formats upon request.

Acknowledgements

Everyone involved in this project would like to extend their thanks to the principals and superintendents who chose to participate in this survey, and to the teachers and school staff who supported this effort. But, most importantly, we would like to thank the students who took the time and effort to share their experiences with us. This report is our way of thanking all of you. We hope that you find the report informative and useful.

The development and implementation of the 2004 Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol Use and Youth Tobacco Survey (MYDAUS/YTS) was a collaborative effort by the Maine Office of Substance Abuse (OSA) and the Bureau of Health (BOH) in the Department of Health and Human Services, the Social Development Research Group (SDRG) at the University of Washington, the Gallup Organization, Pan Atlantic Consultants (PAC), and Market Decisions. In addition to the Maine Office of Substance Abuse and the Maine Bureau of Health which oversaw the entire project, specific duties of the other agencies were as follows:

Pan Atlantic Consultants / Strategic Marketing Services Inc.

Patrick O. Murphy, President

5 Milk Street

Portland, ME 04101

- Responsible for all school recruitment and survey administration activities
- Responsible for data analysis and report production for the Office of Substance Abuse

Market Decisions

Curtis Mildner, President & Senior Consultant

One Park Square

85 E Street

P.O. Box 2890

South Portland, ME 04116

- Responsible for weighting the data
- Responsible for data analysis and report production for the Bureau of Health

The Social Development Research Group

University of Washington

9725 3rd Avenue NE, Suite 401

Seattle, WA 98115-2024

- Developed the survey instrument and syntax relating to survey validity testing
- Provided the risk and protective factor framework
- Developed the basic protocol for administering the survey

For further information about this project, contact:

Office of Substance Abuse
Information and Resource Complex
Marquardt Building, 3rd Floor
11 SHS, AMHI Complex
Augusta, ME 04333-0159
1-800-499-0027
TTY/TDD (207) 287-4475 / 800-215-7604
Osa.ircosa@maine.gov
Or visit the Office of Substance Abuse's website at:
www.maineosa.org

February 2005

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
I. Introduction.....	1
A. Administration.....	2
II. Substance Use.....	5
A. Substance Use – Differences by Grade.....	6
B. Substance Use – Differences by Gender.....	6
C. Substance Use – Differences of Gender within Grade.....	8
D. Substance Use – Differences by County.....	10
E. Substance Use – Differences by Year, 1995-2004.....	17
F. Substance Use – Differences between Maine and the U.S.	25
III. Risk and Protective Factors.....	28
A. Risk Factors.....	29
B. Protective Factors.....	30
C. Risk and Protective Factors – Differences by Grade.....	30
D. Risk and Protective Factors – Differences by Gender.....	34
E. Risk and Protective Factors – Differences by County.....	34
F. Risk and Protective Factors – Differences between Maine and the U.S. ...	42
IV. Prohibited Behaviors.....	44
A. Prohibited Behaviors – Differences by Grade.....	44
B. Prohibited Behaviors – Differences by Gender.....	44
C. Prohibited Behaviors – Differences by County.....	49
D. Prohibited Behaviors – Differences by Year, 1995-2004.....	50
V. Pro-social Behaviors.....	52
A. Pro-social Behaviors – Differences by Grade.....	52
B. Pro-social Behaviors – Differences by Gender.....	52
C. Pro-social Behaviors – Differences by County.....	55
Appendix A – Methodology.....	56
A. Survey Instrument.....	56
B. Sample Design.....	56
C. School Recruitment Procedures.....	56
D. Participation.....	57
E. Procedure.....	57
F. Margin of Error.....	58
G. Method of Weighting.....	60
H. Comparisons in Methodology of Past MYDAUS Surveys.....	67
I. Limitations.....	68
Appendix B – Risk and Protective Factor Definitions.....	69
A. Risk and Protective Factor Scales and Cut-Points.....	69
B. Risk and Protective Factor Definitions.....	69

List of Tables

Number	Title	Page
1	School, Student, and Overall Response Rates for the MYDAUS: 2004.	3
2	Demographic Characteristics of the MYDAUS Sample: 2004.	4
3	Prevalence of Lifetime & Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population by Grade & Gender: 2004.	7
4	Prevalence of Lifetime & Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population by Gender Within Grade: 2004.	9
5	Highest Prevalence of Lifetime & Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.	11
6	Lowest Prevalence of Lifetime & Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.	12
7	Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence Rates of Substance Use: 2004.	16
8	Prevalence of Lifetime Substance Use among the Maine Student Population in Grades 6-12: 1995-2004.	18-19
9	Prevalence of Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population in Grades 6-12: 1995-2004.	20-21
10	Prevalence of Heavy Substance Use among the Maine Student Population versus the National Student Population: 2004.	26
11	Prevalence of Lifetime and Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population versus the National Student Population: 2004.	27
12	Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by Grade, Gender, and Gender within Grade: 2004.	31-32
13	Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “Protected” by Grade, Gender, and Gender within Grade: 2004.	33
14	Highest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by County: 2004.	35-36
15	Lowest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by County: 2004.	37-38
16	Lowest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “Protected” by County: 2004.	39

List of Tables (continued)

Number	Title	Page
17	Highest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “Protected” by County: 2004.	40
18	Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence of Risk Factors: 2004.	41
19	Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence of Protective Factors: 2004.	42
20	Perceived Risk of Substance Use among the Maine Student Population versus the National Student Population: 2004.	43
21	Perceived Availability of Substances by the Maine Student Population versus the National Student Population: 2004.	43
22	Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by Grade & Gender: 2004.	45
23	Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by Gender within Grade: 2004.	46
24	Highest Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.	47
25	Lowest Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.	48
26	Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors: 2004.	49
27	Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors During Previous Year among the Maine Student Population in Grades 6-12: 1995-2004.	51
28	Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by Grade & Gender: 2004.	53
29	Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by Gender within Grade: 2004.	53
30	Lowest Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.	54
31	Highest Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.	54
32	Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors: 2004.	55
33a	Margins of Error for the 2004 MYDAUS by State, Region, and County: 2004.	58
33b	Margins of Error for Different Response Proportions, MTF and MYDAUS.	59
34	Comparison of MYDAUS Methodology and Participation: 1995-2004.	68

I. INTRODUCTION

The Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol Use Survey (MYDAUS) has been administered periodically by the Office of Substance Abuse (OSA) since 1988, and has been providing local data for schools and communities since 1999. The purpose of the MYDAUS is to identify patterns of alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use among middle and high school students in Maine, and to measure the prevalence of the underlying characteristics of a student's social environment which influence his/her decision whether or not to use substances or engage in other prohibited behaviors. These risk and protective factors are found at all social levels: peer group, family, school and the greater community. While the school provides a convenient venue for administering the MYDAUS, the data collected represents the profile of the all those segments of the community. Therefore, in addressing the issues identified everyone needs to be involved. Multiple strategies in multiple domains hold the most promise of success.

In order to ease the burden placed on schools by multiple surveys, the Office of Substance Abuse collaborated with the Bureau of Health (BOH) to create a combined Maine Youth Alcohol and Drug Use Survey and Youth Tobacco Survey for 2004 (MYDAUS/YTS 2004). To accommodate the needs of both agencies without increasing the length of the survey, 19 YTS questions were retained and a similar number of MYDAUS questions were dropped, resulting in the loss of 6 risk factors and one protective factor (see the Methodology section, page 56, for a list of the Risk and Protective Factors that were removed.) This report only presents the results of the original MYDAUS questions and for convenience refers to the survey as the MYDAUS¹.

Because the MYDAUS is offered to all eligible schools² rather than to a random sample, schools are able to use their MYDAUS results for grant applications that require local data, such as their Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act applications. Furthermore, because MYDAUS identifies which specific risk factors are high, and which protective factors are low, communities are better able to focus on interventions which will have the most impact. Once programs are chosen and implemented, the MYDAUS can be used to evaluate their effectiveness.

In the sections of this report that compare MYDAUS 2004 results with results nationwide or with results from prior administrations of the MYDAUS, Margin of Error calculations are used to determine "statistically significant" differences. Because the survey was not completed by all eligible students, an error is introduced when we generalize the results to the whole population. Because of this error (less than 1% at the state level in 2004), we can't say with confidence that one value is larger than another when they are similar in magnitude unless we calculate their Margins of Error (for more information about Margin of Error see Appendix A, Section F).

¹The results for **all** questions asked on the 2004 MYDAUS/YTS can be found on the MYDAUS/YTS website: www.maine.gov/maineosa/survey/home.php. For additional information about the YTS data, contact the Partnership For A Tobacco-Free Maine (PTM) at 207-287-6027 or go to the PTM website at <http://www.tobaccofreemaine.org>. The results in this report may differ somewhat from those available from the BOH because different methods were used to screen out surveys with dishonest answers.

²Public schools or private, non-sectarian schools with 60% or more publicly funded students, with any of grades 6 through 12.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Administration

Every eligible school in Maine was placed in one of five major strata: 1) “Required” – that is, participation in the MYDAUS/YTS was a requirement of a school’s OSA- or BOH-funded grant, 2) “MS sample” – these schools were not required to take the survey, but were selected as part of a random sample of non-required middle schools, 3) “HS sample” – these schools were not required to take the survey, but were selected as part of a random sample of non-required high schools, 4) “MS and HS sample” – these schools, spanning middle and high school grade levels, were not required to take the survey, but were selected as part of both the middle school random samples and high school random samples, 5) “Volunteer” – these schools were not required to take the survey nor were selected as part of either random sample, but nonetheless chose to take the survey. (Please see Appendix A for a detailed description of the survey’s methodology, including the weighting scheme.)

Table 1 shows the response rates from the 2004 MYDAUS by county. In all, there were 75,165 usable¹ surveys, representing 63.3% of the 118,720 total eligible students, and 73.8% of the 101,822 total students at participating schools. Participating students were from 342 of Maine’s 427 eligible public schools; this resulted in a school response rate of 80.1%. The school response rates ranged from a low of 60.0% in Sagadahoc County to a high of 100.0% in Piscataquis County. The overall response rate for the 2004 MYDAUS, taking into consideration both the school and student response rate (in all participating schools, regardless of strata), was 59.1% (school response rate x student response rate; $80.1\% \times 73.8\% = 59.1\%$). The overall response rates ranged from a low of 43.3% in Sagadahoc County to a high of 72.0% in Washington County.

Table 2 illustrates select demographic characteristics of the 2004 MYDAUS respondents: gender, grade, age, and race/ethnicity.

¹ This excludes the students that were deemed to be “dishonest” based on the honesty profile that was run (for more information on the honesty profile, please see Appendix A).

Table 1: School, Student, and Overall Response Rates for the MYDAUS: 2004.

County	Number of Schools (6-12)	Number of Participating Schools	School Response Rate	Number of Students in all Schools (6-12)	Number of Usable Surveys ¹ (Unweighted)	Student Response Rate (vs. eligible)	Number of Students in Participating Schools	Student Response Rate (vs. participating)	Overall Response Rate
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Androscoggin	35	28	80.0%	9,248	5,516	59.6%	7,759	71.1%	56.9%
Aroostook	38	31	81.6%	6,446	4,554	70.6%	5,752	79.2%	64.6%
Cumberland	45	40	88.9%	23,710	16,784	70.8%	22,391	75.0%	66.6%
Franklin	14	13	92.9%	2,875	1,806	62.8%	2,725	66.3%	61.5%
Hancock	35	22	62.9%	4,600	3,114	67.7%	4,122	75.5%	47.5%
Kennebec	28	22	78.6%	10,787	6,489	60.2%	9,352	69.4%	54.5%
Knox	17	13	76.5%	3,103	2,161	69.6%	2,835	76.2%	58.3%
Lincoln	18	12	66.7%	3,247	1,923	59.2%	2,752	69.9%	46.6%
Oxford	24	23	95.8%	6,421	4,532	70.6%	6,415	70.6%	67.7%
Penobscot	43	28	65.1%	13,949	5,611	40.2%	7,657	73.3%	47.7%
Piscataquis	7	7	100.0%	1,901	1,359	71.5%	1,901	71.5%	71.5%
Sagadahoc	10	6	60.0%	3,732	2,456	65.8%	3,407	72.1%	43.3%
Somerset	24	20	83.3%	5,454	3,483	63.9%	4,665	74.7%	62.2%
Waldo	16	15	93.8%	2,863	2,024	70.7%	2,796	72.4%	67.9%
Washington	37	36	97.3%	2,863	2,113	73.8%	2,854	74.0%	72.0%
York	36	26	72.2%	17,521	11,240	64.2%	14,439	77.8%	56.2%
TOTAL	427	342	80.1%	118,720	75,165	63.3%	101,822	73.8%	59.1%

Sources: Columns 1, 4, and 7 – Maine Department of Education, 2004; Columns 2 and 5 – 2004 MYDAUS

Equations: Column 3 = Column 2 / Column 1; Column 6 = Column 5 / Column 4; Column 8 = Column 5 / Column 7; Column 9 = Column 3 x Column 8

¹ This excludes the students that were deemed to be “dishonest” based on the honesty profile that was run (for more information on the honesty profile, please see Appendix A)

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of the MYDAUS Sample: 2004.

	Unweighted Number ¹	Unweighted Percent	Weighted Percent
TOTAL	75,165	100.0%	100.0%
GENDER			
Female	35,917	47.8%	46.5%
Male	33,529	44.6%	47.7%
Missing	5,719	7.6%	5.8%
GRADE IN SCHOOL			
6 th grade	11,594	15.4%	14.4%
7 th grade	11,665	15.5%	14.3%
8 th grade	11,770	15.7%	14.4%
9 th grade	11,489	15.3%	14.6%
10 th grade	10,476	13.9%	14.5%
11 th grade	9,305	12.4%	13.8%
12 th grade	7,972	10.6%	13.0%
Missing	894	1.2%	0.9%
AGE (YEARS)			
11 or younger	5,795	7.7%	7.1%
12	11,025	14.7%	13.6%
13	11,675	15.5%	14.3%
14	11,447	15.2%	14.2%
15	10,976	14.6%	14.4%
16	10,161	13.5%	14.5%
17	8,819	11.7%	13.6%
18 or older	4,654	6.2%	7.5%
Missing	613	0.8%	0.7%
RACE/ETHNICITY			
White, not of Hispanic Origin	61,869	82.3%	82.7%
Black or African American	1,348	1.8%	1.8%
American Indian (includes Native American, Eskimo, and Aleut)	2,262	3.0%	3.0%
Spanish/Hispanic/Latino	1,094	1.5%	1.4%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,188	1.6%	1.6%
Other	2,312	3.1%	3.0%
Missing	5,092	6.8%	6.5%

¹ This excludes the students that were deemed to be “dishonest” based on the honesty profile that was run (for more information on the honesty profile, please see Appendix A).

II. SUBSTANCE USE

In Maine, alcohol, tobacco (in the form of cigarettes), and marijuana are the substances most commonly used by students in grades 6 through 12 (see Table 3).

- Fifty-one percent (50.7%) of students have had alcohol in their lifetime, 30.3% have smoked cigarettes¹, and 26.9% have used marijuana.
- In the month² before the survey, 29.7% of students had used alcohol, 14.8% had smoked marijuana, and 14.6% had smoked cigarettes.
- Nearly three in ten 12th grade students (29.0%) reported binge drinking in the two weeks before the survey.

Other commonly used substances include prescription drugs (prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student), inhalants, other illegal drugs³, and smokeless tobacco.

- Seventeen percent (16.6%) of students have used prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for them in their lifetime, 12.0% have used inhalants, 11.7% have used other illegal drugs, and 10.0% have used smokeless tobacco.
- In the month before the survey, 7.8% of students had used prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for them, 6.3% had used other illegal drugs, 4.9% had used inhalants, and 4.3% had used smokeless tobacco.

The least commonly used substances by Maine youth are LSD or other psychedelics, cocaine, MDMA (Ecstasy), stimulants, and heroin.

- Less than five percent (4.6%) of Maine youth have used LSD or another psychedelic in their lifetime, and 4.6% have used cocaine. Approximately four percent (3.9%) of students have taken MDMA or Ecstasy, 3.8% have taken stimulants, and 2.0% have used heroin.
- In the month before the survey, 2.2% of students had used LSD or another psychedelic, 2.0% had used cocaine, 1.4% had used MDMA or Ecstasy, 1.7% had used stimulants, and 1.0% had used heroin.

Nearly 16 percent (15.5%) of students reported having had five or more alcoholic drinks in a row in the two weeks preceding the survey; this is referred to as “binge drinking”.

¹ The question that the Office of Substance Abuse uses in this report to define lifetime cigarette use is, “Have you ever smoked cigarettes?” The Bureau of Health uses the following question to define lifetime cigarette use: “Have you ever tried cigarette smoking, even one or two puffs?” As there are significant differences in the way in which these two questions are worded, the results of these questions cannot be compared or used as substitutes for one another.

² Please note that use of the phrases “past-month” and “past 30 day” as they relate to student behaviors refers to the 30-day period prior to the administration of the survey.

³ “Other illegal drugs” includes any illegal drugs not specifically referred to in the MYDAUS.

II. SUBSTANCE USE

A. Substance Use – Differences by Grade

Not surprisingly, for most substances prevalence rates increase with grade in school (see Table 3). This holds for both lifetime and past-month use. There are several exceptions worth noting, however:

- Lifetime inhalant use peaks in the 8th grade (15.3%), with the next highest prevalence rates in the 9th grade (14.1%) and 10th grade (12.0%).
- Inhalant use in the month preceding the survey was higher among middle school students than high school students. Prevalence rates for past-month use peaks in the 8th grade (7.6%), with the next highest rate in the 7th grade (6.1%).
- Past-month use of LSD levels off in the 10th grade, as does past-month use of stimulants.
- Lifetime and past-month use of prescription drugs and other illegal drugs peak in the 11th grade. There are several other instances where prevalence rates for the 11th grade are higher than those for the 12th grade. In each instance, however, the difference between the prevalence rates is less than one percentage point.

B. Substance Use – Differences by Gender

Table 3 also illustrates that prevalence rates for male students are higher than those for female students for the following substances:

- ✓ Smokeless tobacco (lifetime and past-month)
- ✓ Alcohol (past-month)
- ✓ Binge drinking (past two weeks)
- ✓ Marijuana (lifetime and past-month)
- ✓ LSD (lifetime and past-month)
- ✓ Cocaine (lifetime and past-month)
- ✓ Ecstasy (lifetime and past-month)
- ✓ Stimulants (lifetime and past-month)
- ✓ Heroin (lifetime and past-month)
- ✓ Other illegal drugs (lifetime and past-month)

There are no differences between males and females for the prevalence rates of inhalants (lifetime and past-month), as well as past-month cigarette use and lifetime alcohol use.

Overall prevalence rates for female students are actually higher than those for male students for lifetime use of cigarettes and prescription drug use (prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student) – both lifetime and past-month use.

Table 3: Prevalence of Lifetime & Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population by Grade & Gender: 2004.

		6 th grade	7 th grade	8 th grade	9 th grade	10 th grade	11 th grade	12 th grade		Female	Male	State Average
Smokeless Tobacco	Lifetime	3.5	4.8	7.6	9.4	12.5	14.6	17.7		5.3	14.3	10.0
	30 day	1.3	2.2	3.1	4.3	5.5	6.4	7.3		2.2	6.1	4.3
Cigarettes	Lifetime	9.2	16.1	25.5	31.9	38.9	43.7	46.8		31.1	28.7	30.3
	30 day	3.1	5.9	10.8	15.6	19.2	22.2	24.8		14.4	14.2	14.6
Alcohol	Lifetime	17.9	27.2	42.7	54.9	64.8	72.0	75.6		50.5	49.9	50.7
	30 day	6.7	12.1	22.4	32.5	40.3	45.2	49.2		29.0	29.7	29.7
Binge drinking	Two weeks	2.2	4.3	9.2	15.8	21.7	26.3	29.0		13.3	17.0	15.5
Marijuana	Lifetime	2.6	6.6	14.8	27.4	39.4	47.3	50.6		24.7	28.0	26.9
	30 day	1.4	3.4	7.9	15.6	22.5	25.8	26.8		12.8	16.1	14.8
LSD	Lifetime	0.7	1.2	2.9	4.4	6.4	7.6	8.8		3.7	5.2	4.6
	30 day	0.6	0.8	1.6	2.4	3.2	3.1	3.2		1.6	2.6	2.2
Cocaine	Lifetime	1.1	1.7	3.1	4.3	6.0	7.7	8.6		3.8	5.3	4.6
	30 day	0.5	0.7	1.5	1.9	2.6	3.1	3.6		1.4	2.5	2.0
Ecstasy	Lifetime	0.7	1.1	2.9	3.8	5.1	6.6	7.3		3.5	4.2	3.9
	30 day	0.4	0.6	1.4	1.8	1.7	2.1	1.6		1.0	1.7	1.4
Inhalants	Lifetime	10.1	11.5	15.3	14.1	12.0	11.1	9.3		11.8	12.2	12.0
	30 day	5.3	6.1	7.6	5.7	4.0	3.3	2.1		4.9	5.0	4.9
Stimulants	Lifetime	0.7	1.1	2.4	3.8	5.7	6.5	6.4		3.2	4.2	3.8
	30 day	0.3	0.6	1.2	1.6	2.7	2.8	2.7		1.3	2.0	1.7
Heroin	Lifetime	0.7	0.9	1.8	2.3	2.9	3.0	2.5		1.6	2.4	2.0
	30 day	0.4	0.6	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.0		0.6	1.3	1.0
Prescription Drugs ¹	Lifetime	7.2	8.9	13.2	17.5	22.1	24.6	22.3		17.3	15.5	16.6
	30 day	2.8	3.7	6.1	8.9	11.0	11.6	10.3		7.9	7.4	7.8
Other illegal drugs	Lifetime	2.1	4.1	8.9	13.4	17.7	19.1	16.5		10.5	12.5	11.7
	30 day	0.9	2.0	4.5	7.6	10.2	10.2	8.4		5.3	7.1	6.3

Note: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

¹ Prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student.

II. SUBSTANCE USE

C. Substance Use – Differences of Gender within Grade

Table 4 shows the prevalence rates for each gender, by grade. While approximately half of the prevalence rates are significantly higher for males than for females within each grade, there are many instances where the prevalence rates are higher for females than for males and where there is no appreciable difference between the genders.

For Grade 6, the prevalence rates for each of the substances are significantly higher for males than for females with the following exceptions: lifetime LSD use, as well as lifetime and past-month prescription drug use¹ are statistically the same for males and females.

Among 7th grade students, females were more likely than males to have taken prescription drugs* in the 30 days preceding the survey. The following prevalence rates were not statistically different for males and females: cigarettes (past-month), cocaine (lifetime and past-month), Ecstasy (lifetime and past-month), inhalants (lifetime and past-month), stimulants (lifetime and past-month), heroin (lifetime), and prescription drugs (lifetime).

For Grade 8, the prevalence rates for cigarettes (lifetime and past-month), alcohol (past-month), inhalants (lifetime and past-month), and prescription drugs (lifetime and past-month) are higher for females than for males. The following prevalence rates were not appreciably different between males and females: alcohol (lifetime), binge drinking (past two weeks), LSD (lifetime), cocaine (lifetime), stimulants (lifetime and past-month), and heroin (lifetime).

Among 9th grade students, females had higher prevalence rates than males for the following substances: cigarettes (lifetime and past-month), alcohol (lifetime and past-month), Ecstasy (lifetime), inhalants (lifetime and past-month), and prescription drugs (lifetime and past-month). The prevalence rates for the following substances were not statistically significant among males and females in the 9th grade: binge drinking (past two weeks), LSD (lifetime), cocaine (lifetime), stimulants (lifetime and past-month), heroin (lifetime), and other illegal drugs (lifetime and past-month).

In Grade 10, the prevalence rates for cigarettes (lifetime), alcohol (lifetime), inhalants (lifetime), and prescription drugs (lifetime and past-month) are higher for females than for males. There were no appreciable differences among males and females for the following substances: cigarettes (past-month), alcohol (past-month), and inhalants (past-month).

Among students in the 11th grade, females had higher prevalence rates than males for the following substances: cigarettes (lifetime), alcohol (lifetime), and prescription drugs (lifetime). Prevalence rates were statistically the same for past-month cigarette use and past-month prescription drug use.

In Grade 12, the prevalence rates for males were higher than females for all substances, with the exception of lifetime cigarette use and lifetime alcohol use. In these two instances, the prevalence rates were statistically higher for females than for males.

¹ Prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student.

Table 4: Prevalence of Lifetime & Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population by Gender Within Grade: 2004.

		6 th grade		7 th grade		8 th grade		9 th grade		10 th grade		11 th grade		12 th grade		State Avg.
		F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
Smokeless Tobacco	Lifetime	2.1	4.8	2.9	6.7	4.9	10.3	5.8	12.7	6.7	18.4	7.4	21.5	7.5	27.6	10.0
	30 day	0.7	1.9	1.6	2.8	2.4	3.9	2.9	5.5	2.9	8.2	2.5	9.7	2.5	12.0	4.3
Cigarettes	Lifetime	8.6	9.8	15.2	16.9	27.3	23.5	34.5	29.1	40.7	36.9	45.0	41.6	47.9	45.4	30.3
	30 day	2.7	3.4	6.1	5.7	11.5	9.8	16.7	14.2	19.4	18.9	22.1	21.9	22.8	26.7	14.6
Alcohol	Lifetime	14.8	20.9	24.6	29.7	42.6	42.7	57.1	52.4	67.2	62.5	73.6	70.3	76.5	74.7	50.7
	30 day	5.5	7.9	11.1	12.8	23.1	21.5	34.0	30.8	40.0	40.4	43.6	46.3	47.2	51.2	29.7
Binge drinking	Two weeks	1.7	2.7	3.8	4.7	8.8	9.5	15.1	16.2	19.5	23.6	22.2	30.2	23.0	34.9	15.5
Marijuana	Lifetime	2.0	3.1	5.4	7.7	12.9	16.8	25.2	29.2	37.9	41.0	45.0	49.2	47.7	53.1	26.9
	30 day	1.1	1.6	2.8	3.9	7.0	8.7	14.0	16.9	20.2	25.0	23.6	27.2	22.1	31.4	14.8
LSD	Lifetime	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.4	2.6	3.1	4.3	4.6	5.5	7.1	6.3	8.4	5.7	11.7	4.6
	30 day	0.3	0.8	0.6	1.0	1.2	1.9	2.1	2.7	2.6	3.7	1.9	4.1	2.0	4.5	2.2
Cocaine	Lifetime	0.8	1.3	1.6	1.8	2.9	3.4	4.0	4.6	4.9	6.9	6.0	9.1	6.6	10.6	4.6
	30 day	0.3	0.7	0.6	0.8	1.1	2.0	1.4	2.2	1.8	3.3	2.0	3.9	2.6	4.6	2.0
Ecstasy	Lifetime	0.3	1.0	1.0	1.1	2.6	3.2	4.2	3.5	4.7	5.5	5.5	7.2	6.4	8.3	3.9
	30 day	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.7	1.0	1.7	1.5	2.2	1.2	2.1	1.3	2.9	0.9	2.2	1.4
Inhalants	Lifetime	8.4	11.8	11.1	12.0	16.5	14.0	15.5	12.7	12.7	11.4	10.3	11.6	6.9	11.6	12.0
	30 day	4.4	6.2	6.0	6.3	8.4	6.8	6.5	4.9	4.0	4.0	2.5	3.9	1.5	2.7	4.9
Stimulants	Lifetime	0.4	1.0	0.9	1.2	2.2	2.5	3.7	4.1	4.8	6.4	5.6	7.1	5.0	7.6	3.8
	30 day	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.6	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.8	2.1	3.3	2.2	3.4	1.9	3.4	1.7
Heroin	Lifetime	0.4	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.7	1.7	2.3	2.4	2.1	3.6	2.0	3.8	1.7	3.2	2.0
	30 day	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.7	0.8	1.1	0.8	1.2	0.9	1.9	0.6	2.0	0.5	1.3	1.0
Prescription Drugs¹	Lifetime	6.9	7.4	9.2	8.6	15.2	10.9	19.8	15.1	24.5	19.7	25.5	23.6	19.9	24.3	16.6
	30 day	2.6	2.9	4.1	3.3	7.6	4.6	10.0	7.9	11.6	10.2	11.1	11.7	8.3	11.8	7.8
Other illegal drugs	Lifetime	1.7	2.4	3.6	4.6	8.1	9.7	12.9	13.7	16.9	18.5	16.6	21.0	14.1	18.6	11.7
	30 day	0.6	1.2	1.5	2.5	4.0	4.9	7.3	7.8	9.3	11.2	8.2	11.9	6.1	10.5	6.3

Notes: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

¹ Prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student.

II. SUBSTANCE USE

D. Substance Use – Differences by County

Smokeless Tobacco – Lifetime Use

- Table 5 shows that the counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime smokeless tobacco use are Knox (13.8%), Washington (13.3%), and Oxford (13.0%).
- Androscoggin (7.6%), Cumberland (8.4%), and Kennebec (8.5%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of smokeless tobacco (see Table 6).

Smokeless Tobacco – Past-month Use

- Knox (6.4%), Oxford (5.7%), and Lincoln (5.5%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of smokeless tobacco.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of smokeless tobacco are Cumberland (3.5%), Androscoggin (3.8%), Kennebec (3.8%), and York (3.8%).

Cigarettes – Lifetime Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime cigarette use are Knox (35.6%), Aroostook (35.0%), and Penobscot (34.7%).
- Cumberland (25.4%), York (27.0%), and Kennebec (28.7%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of cigarettes.

Cigarettes – Past-month Use

- Lincoln (18.1%), Aroostook (17.5%), Knox (17.1%), and Washington (17.1%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of cigarettes.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of cigarettes are Cumberland (11.8%), York (12.8%), and Androscoggin (13.5%).

Alcohol – Lifetime Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime alcohol use are Lincoln (56.6%), Penobscot (54.4%), and Piscataquis (54.4%).
- Kennebec (45.6%), Androscoggin (47.5%), and Hancock (48.5%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of alcohol.

Alcohol – Past-month Use

- Lincoln (36.8%), Franklin (34.5%), and Penobscot (32.7%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of alcohol.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of alcohol are Kennebec (26.1%), Hancock (26.9%), and Washington (26.9%).

Table 5: Highest Prevalence of Lifetime & Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.

		Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Smokeless Tobacco	Lifetime	7.6	10.6	8.4	10.9	11.7	8.5	13.8	12.2	13.0	11.6	11.2	9.4	10.7	10.7	13.3	8.6	10.0
	30 day	3.8	4.6	3.5	5.3	4.5	3.8	6.4	5.5	5.7	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.4	5.2	3.8	4.3
Cigarettes	Lifetime	28.9	35.0	25.4	31.8	30.0	28.7	35.6	33.6	32.2	34.7	33.2	30.4	34.6	31.3	33.9	27.0	30.3
	30 day	13.5	17.5	11.8	16.6	14.6	14.4	17.1	18.1	14.7	16.5	14.0	15.8	15.9	16.1	17.1	12.8	14.6
Alcohol	Lifetime	47.5	50.5	50.4	53.5	48.5	45.6	53.5	56.6	53.0	54.4	54.4	53.2	51.5	50.1	48.8	49.4	50.7
	30 day	27.8	29.3	30.4	34.5	26.9	26.1	32.5	36.8	29.9	32.7	29.1	32.0	29.1	29.6	26.9	28.2	29.7
Binge drinking	Two weeks	14.7	14.7	15.1	19.7	13.6	14.2	17.6	21.5	14.8	17.4	13.7	16.1	16.1	16.4	14.8	14.0	15.5
Marijuana	Lifetime	25.7	25.5	27.1	26.3	24.5	26.5	31.4	33.4	28.9	28.8	25.1	28.7	27.7	26.1	23.1	24.8	26.9
	30 day	14.7	13.1	15.4	13.7	14.2	14.4	19.7	19.4	15.2	15.5	12.0	16.3	15.0	14.9	12.9	13.0	14.8
LSD	Lifetime	4.0	4.4	4.8	3.6	3.5	4.7	6.4	5.4	4.6	5.2	3.6	5.7	4.5	5.2	3.2	4.0	4.6
	30 day	2.0	1.9	2.2	1.7	1.6	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.0	2.7	1.8	2.6	2.3	2.5	1.4	1.8	2.2
Cocaine	Lifetime	4.1	4.9	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.5	7.2	5.5	4.6	5.3	3.2	5.1	4.8	5.8	3.8	4.6	4.6
	30 day	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.4	1.3	2.0	3.3	2.7	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.0	1.2	1.9	2.0
Ecstasy	Lifetime	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.7	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.8	3.6	3.9	4.1	5.4	3.2	4.1	3.9
	30 day	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.2	2.0	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.9	1.5	1.2	1.4
Inhalants	Lifetime	11.9	11.2	10.0	11.9	12.8	11.7	15.8	12.4	13.2	12.4	12.8	11.0	13.4	16.5	9.0	12.8	12.0
	30 day	5.0	5.0	3.8	5.1	5.2	5.4	6.1	4.3	5.2	5.4	5.1	5.1	5.5	7.6	3.3	5.1	4.9
Stimulants	Lifetime	3.5	4.1	3.9	3.2	2.9	3.8	4.5	4.9	4.0	4.3	3.8	4.2	4.2	5.0	2.5	3.3	3.8
	30 day	1.7	2.0	1.8	1.3	1.6	2.0	1.5	2.6	1.6	1.8	1.2	1.8	1.9	2.5	0.6	1.4	1.7
Heroin	Lifetime	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.5	2.2	2.8 ²	2.3	2.2	2.5	1.8	2.4	2.1	3.0	2.2	1.8	2.0
	30 day	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.1	0.7	1.3	1.1 ²	1.6	1.0	1.2	0.5	1.4	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.0
Prescription Drugs ¹	Lifetime	14.8	16.3	16.0	14.8	14.7	15.7	21.4 ²	16.5	16.7	18.5	17.6	17.7	18.4	19.5	12.8	17.4	16.6
	30 day	6.6	8.8	7.1	7.4	6.5	7.8	9.2 ²	7.8	7.9	9.2	8.2	9.1	9.4	9.3	5.6	7.7	7.8
Other illegal drugs	Lifetime	10.6	12.1	11.2	12.2	9.6	11.4	14.6 ²	14.3	12.0	13.4	11.4	13.1	12.7	13.8	9.0	10.9	11.7
	30 day	5.7	6.4	6.0	6.0	5.5	6.6	8.1 ²	8.5	6.8	6.7	5.4	7.5	7.0	7.7	4.7	5.7	6.3

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.

■ Represents the county with the highest use rate in each category ■ Represents the counties with the second and third highest use rates in each category

¹ Prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student.

² Data are not representative of the county as a whole (see page 16 for further explanation).

Table 6: Lowest Prevalence of Lifetime & Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.

		Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Smokeless Tobacco	Lifetime	7.6	10.6	8.4	10.9	11.7	8.5	13.8	12.2	13.0	11.6	11.2	9.4	10.7	10.7	13.3	8.6	10.0
	30 day	3.8	4.6	3.5	5.3	4.5	3.8	6.4	5.5	5.7	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.4	5.2	3.8	4.3
Cigarettes	Lifetime	28.9	35.0	25.4	31.8	30.0	28.7	35.6	33.6	32.2	34.7	33.2	30.4	34.6	31.3	33.9	27.0	30.3
	30 day	13.5	17.5	11.8	16.6	14.6	14.4	17.1	18.1	14.7	16.5	14.0	15.8	15.9	16.1	17.1	12.8	14.6
Alcohol	Lifetime	47.5	50.5	50.4	53.5	48.5	45.6	53.5	56.6	53.0	54.4	54.4	53.2	51.5	50.1	48.8	49.4	50.7
	30 day	27.8	29.3	30.4	34.5	26.9	26.1	32.5	36.8	29.9	32.7	29.1	32.0	29.1	29.6	26.9	28.2	29.7
Binge drinking	Two weeks	14.7	14.7	15.1	19.7	13.6	14.2	17.6	21.5	14.8	17.4	13.7	16.1	16.1	16.4	14.8	14.0	15.5
Marijuana	Lifetime	25.7	25.5	27.1	26.3	24.5	26.5	31.4	33.4	28.9	28.8	25.1	28.7	27.7	26.1	23.1	24.8	26.9
	30 day	14.7	13.1	15.4	13.7	14.2	14.4	19.7	19.4	15.2	15.5	12.0	16.3	15.0	14.9	12.9	13.0	14.8
LSD	Lifetime	4.0	4.4	4.8	3.6	3.5	4.7	6.4	5.4	4.6	5.2	3.6	5.7	4.5	5.2	3.2	4.0	4.6
	30 day	2.0	1.9	2.2	1.7	1.6	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.0	2.7	1.8	2.6	2.3	2.5	1.4	1.8	2.2
Cocaine	Lifetime	4.1	4.9	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.5	7.2	5.5	4.6	5.3	3.2	5.1	4.8	5.8	3.8	4.6	4.6
	30 day	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.4	1.3	2.0	3.3	2.7	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.0	1.2	1.9	2.0
Ecstasy	Lifetime	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.7	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.8	3.6	3.9	4.1	5.4	3.2	4.1	3.9
	30 day	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.2	2.0	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.9	1.5	1.2	1.4
Inhalants	Lifetime	11.9	11.2	10.0	11.9	12.8	11.7	15.8	12.4	13.2	12.4	12.8	11.0	13.4	16.5	9.0	12.8	12.0
	30 day	5.0	5.0	3.8	5.1	5.2	5.4	6.1	4.3	5.2	5.4	5.1	5.1	5.5	7.6	3.3	5.1	4.9
Stimulants	Lifetime	3.5	4.1	3.9	3.2	2.9	3.8	4.5	4.9	4.0	4.3	3.8	4.2	4.2	5.0	2.5	3.3	3.8
	30 day	1.7	2.0	1.8	1.3	1.6	2.0	1.5	2.6	1.6	1.8	1.2	1.8	1.9	2.5	0.6	1.4	1.7
Heroin	Lifetime	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.5	2.2	2.8 ²	2.3	2.2	2.5	1.8	2.4	2.1	3.0	2.2	1.8	2.0
	30 day	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.1	0.7	1.3	1.1 ²	1.6	1.0	1.2	0.5	1.4	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.0
Prescription Drugs ¹	Lifetime	14.8	16.3	16.0	14.8	14.7	15.7	21.4 ²	16.5	16.7	18.5	17.6	17.7	18.4	19.5	12.8	17.4	16.6
	30 day	6.6	8.8	7.1	7.4	6.5	7.8	9.2 ²	7.8	7.9	9.2	8.2	9.1	9.4	9.3	5.6	7.7	7.8
Other illegal drugs	Lifetime	10.6	12.1	11.2	12.2	9.6	11.4	14.6 ²	14.3	12.0	13.4	11.4	13.1	12.7	13.8	9.0	10.9	11.7
	30 day	5.7	6.4	6.0	6.0	5.5	6.6	8.1 ²	8.5	6.8	6.7	5.4	7.5	7.0	7.7	4.7	5.7	6.3

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.

■ Represents the county with the lowest use rate in each category

■ Represents the counties with the second and third lowest use rates in each category

¹ Prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student.

² Data are not representative of the county as a whole (see page 16 for further explanation).

II. SUBSTANCE USE

Binge Drinking – Past Two Week Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for two week participation in binge drinking (that is, consuming five or more drinks in a row) are Lincoln (21.5%), Franklin (19.7%), and Knox (17.6%).
- Hancock (13.6%), Piscataquis (13.7%), and York (14.0%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for binge drinking (past two weeks).

Marijuana – Lifetime Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime marijuana use are Lincoln (33.4%), Knox (31.4%), and Oxford (28.9%).
- Washington (23.1%), Hancock (24.5%), and York (24.8%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of marijuana.

Marijuana – Past-month Use

- Knox (19.7%), Lincoln (19.4%), and Sagadahoc (16.3%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of marijuana.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of marijuana are Piscataquis (12.0%), Washington (12.9%), and York (13.0%).

LSD – Lifetime Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime LSD use are Knox (6.4%), Sagadahoc (5.7%), and Lincoln (5.4%).
- Washington (3.2%), Hancock (3.5%), Franklin (3.6%), and Piscataquis (3.6%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of LSD.

LSD – Past-month Use

- Penobscot (2.7%), Sagadahoc (2.6%), Kennebec (2.5%), Knox (2.5%), and Waldo (2.5%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of LSD.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of LSD are Washington (1.4%), Hancock (1.6%), and Franklin (1.7%).

Cocaine – Lifetime Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime cocaine use are Knox (7.2%), Waldo (5.8%), and Lincoln (5.5%).
- Piscataquis (3.2%), Hancock (3.8%), and Washington (3.8%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of cocaine.

II. SUBSTANCE USE

Cocaine – Past-month Use

- Knox (3.3%), Lincoln (2.7%), and Sagadahoc (2.3%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of cocaine.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of cocaine are Washington (1.2%), Hancock (1.3%), and Franklin (1.4%).

Ecstasy – Lifetime Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime Ecstasy use are Waldo (5.4%), Penobscot (4.8%), and Lincoln (4.4%).
- Hancock (2.8%), Franklin (3.2%), and Washington (3.2%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of Ecstasy.

Ecstasy – Past-month Use

- Penobscot (2.0%), Waldo (1.9%), and Sagadahoc (1.6%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of Ecstasy.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of Ecstasy are Hancock (1.0%), Androscoggin (1.2%), Oxford (1.2%), Somerset (1.2%), and York (1.2%).

Inhalants – Lifetime Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime inhalant use are Waldo (16.5%), Knox (15.8%), and Somerset (13.4%).
- Washington (9.0%), Cumberland (10.0%), and Sagadahoc (11.0%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of inhalants.

Inhalants – Past-month Use

- Waldo (7.6%), Knox (6.1%), and Somerset (5.5%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of inhalants.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of inhalants are Washington (3.3%), Cumberland (3.8%), and Lincoln (4.3%).

Stimulants – Lifetime Use

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime stimulant use are Waldo (5.0%), Lincoln (4.9%), and Knox (4.5%).
- Washington (2.5%), Hancock (2.9%), and Franklin (3.2%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of stimulants.

II. SUBSTANCE USE

Stimulants – Past-month Use

- Lincoln (2.6%), Waldo (2.5%), Aroostook (2.0%), and Kennebec (2.0%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of stimulants.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of stimulants are Washington (0.6%), Piscataquis (1.2%), and Franklin (1.3%).

Heroin – Lifetime Use¹

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime heroin use are Waldo (3.0%), Knox (2.8%), and Penobscot (2.5%).
- Hancock (1.5%), Androscoggin (1.8%), Piscataquis (1.8%), and York (1.8%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of heroin.

Heroin – Past-month Use¹

- Lincoln (1.6%), Sagadahoc (1.4%), and Kennebec (1.3%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of heroin.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of heroin are Piscataquis (0.5%), Hancock (0.7%), Androscoggin (0.8%), and York (0.8%).

Prescription Drugs – Lifetime Use¹

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime use of prescription drugs (prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student) are Knox (21.4%), Waldo (19.5%), and Penobscot (18.5%).
- Washington (12.8%), Hancock (14.7%), Androscoggin (14.8%), and Franklin (14.8%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of other prescription drugs.

Prescription Drugs – Past-month Use¹

- Somerset (9.4%), Waldo (9.3%), Knox (9.2%), and Penobscot (9.2%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of prescription drugs.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of prescription drugs are Washington (5.6%), Hancock (6.5%), and Androscoggin (6.6%).

Other Illegal Drugs – Lifetime Use¹

- The counties with the highest prevalence rates for lifetime use of other illegal drugs are Knox (14.6%), Lincoln (14.3%), and Waldo (13.8%).
- Washington (9.0%), Hancock (9.6%), and Androscoggin (10.6%) are the counties with the lowest prevalence rates for lifetime use of other illegal drugs.

¹ Data for Knox County are not representative of the county as a whole (see page 16 for further explanation).

II. SUBSTANCE USE

Other Illegal Drugs – Past-month Use¹

- Lincoln (8.5%), Knox (8.1%), and Waldo (7.7%) are the counties with the highest prevalence rates for past-month use of other illegal drugs.
- The counties with the lowest prevalence rates for past-month use of other illegal drugs are Washington (4.7%), Piscataquis (5.4%), and Hancock (5.5%).

Overall, the counties with the greatest number of high substance use prevalence rates are Knox¹, Lincoln, and Waldo (see Table 7 below).

The counties with the greatest number of low substance use prevalence rates are Hancock, Washington, and Androscoggin.

Table 7: Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence Rates of Substance Use: 2004.

	Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Highest</u> Prevalence Rates				Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Lowest</u> Prevalence Rates		
	1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ²		1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ²
Androscoggin	0	0	0		1	9	10
Aroostook	0	3	3		0	0	0
Cumberland	0	0	0		3	3	6
Franklin	0	2	2		0	7	7
Hancock	0	0	0		4	13	17
Kennebec	0	3	3		2	3	5
Knox*	9*	10*	19*		0*	0*	0*
Lincoln	8	8	16		0	1	1
Oxford	0	3	3		0	1	1
Penobscot	2	7	9		0	0	0
Piscataquis	0	1	1		3	5	8
Sagadahoc	0	6	6		0	1	1
Somerset	1	2	3		0	1	1
Waldo	5	8	13		0	0	0
Washington	0	2	2		12	4	16
York	0	0	0		0	9	9

¹ Questions on the use of heroin and prescription drugs were not included in the version of the MYDAUS administered to schools participating in the Community Youth Development Study (CYDS). This potentially affects not only the results of these questions, but also influences the results for “other illegal drugs” for the CYDS schools, since the meaning of “other” depends on what specific drugs are also asked on the survey. Schools participating in CYDS are located in Kennebec, Knox, Penobscot, and Waldo Counties. A high proportion of Knox County schools that participated in the MYDAUS are CYDS schools; therefore, the data for these questions cannot be seen as representative of the county as a whole.

² The highest possible number per county is 25, as there are 25 different prevalence rates included in this analysis.

II. SUBSTANCE USE

E. Substance Use – Differences by Year, 1995-2004

The MYDAUS was administered in 1995, 1996, 1998/9, 2000, 2002, and 2004. These earlier data provide important comparisons to the 2004 results for the purpose of monitoring any changes in drug use behaviors over time among Maine middle and high school students (see Tables 8 and 9). Although such comparisons can be useful, it is very important to note that there have been significant changes in methodology throughout the history of the survey that may have impacted the results; therefore, any comparisons between the data should be made with caution (see Appendix A for a discussion of differences in survey methodologies).

Despite these caveats, it is useful to note rate changes over the past several years:

Alcohol – Lifetime Use

- The overall lifetime alcohol use rate among Maine's 6th to 12th grade students has dropped consistently over the past decade – from 70.7% in 1995 to 50.7% in 2004. The current finding represents a 2.8 percentage point drop from 2002 (53.5%).
- Since 2002, the largest decreases occurred among 12th grade (-3.7 percentage points), 10th grade (-3.1 percentage points), and 7th grade (-3.1 percentage points) students.

Alcohol – Past-month Use

- After an initial drop from 1995 (38.0%) to 1998/9 (31.1%), the average rate of past-month alcohol use among students in grades 6 through 12 has leveled off in recent years. The current rate of 29.7% is nearly identical to the 2002 finding of 29.5%.

Marijuana – Lifetime Use

- After holding steady since 1995, the prevalence rate of lifetime marijuana use has decreased slightly from 2002 (29.8%) to 2004 (26.9%).
- Since 1995, decreases were seen across all grades, with the exception of grade 11. The most dramatic decreases occurred among 8th graders (-11.2 percentage points) and 9th graders (-12.7 percentage points). There have also been reductions in use in all grades since 2002, especially among 12th graders (-4.7 percentage points).

Marijuana – Past-month Use

- Since 1995, there has been a significant decrease in the past month use of marijuana. In 1995, the prevalence of past-month marijuana use was 19.4%, compared with the current figure of 14.8%.
- Reductions of past-month use of marijuana were seen across all grades when compared with 1995 rates, especially among 9th graders (-12.5 percentage points); since 2002 the most significant decreases in use have been in the 11th (-3.4 percentage points) and 8th grades (-2.7 percentage points).

Table 8: Prevalence of Lifetime Substance Use among the Maine Student Population in Grades 6-12: 1995-2004.

	LIFETIME USE						Percentage Point Change	
	1995	1996	1998/9	2000	2002	2004	Since 1995	Since 2002
Alcohol								
6 th grade	40.5%	36.8%	23.8%	23.1%	19.6%	17.9%	-22.6	-1.7
7 th grade	60.3%	59.1%	35.1%	34.9%	30.3%	27.2%	-33.1	-3.1
8 th grade	72.4%	69.6%	52.1%	50.1%	44.9%	42.7%	-29.7	-2.2
9 th grade	78.4%	77.2%	62.9%	63.1%	57.1%	54.9%	-23.5	-2.2
10 th grade	81.3%	84.3%	70.7%	72.1%	67.9%	64.8%	-16.5	-3.1
11 th grade	82.6%	85.8%	79.4%	77.9%	74.8%	72.0%	-10.6	-2.8
12 th grade	88.8%	87.8%	84.2%	82.2%	79.3%	75.6%	-13.2	-3.7
Total	70.7%	68.0%	57.6%	56.9%	53.5%	50.7%	-20.0	-2.8
Marijuana								
6 th grade	4.6%	4.4%	2.2%	3.9%	3.2%	2.6%	-2.0	-0.6
7 th grade	12.8%	15.2%	6.6%	8.5%	8.6%	6.6%	-6.2	-2.0
8 th grade	26.0%	26.3%	17.2%	17.3%	18.4%	14.8%	-11.2	-3.6
9 th grade	40.1%	38.3%	31.2%	31.7%	30.1%	27.4%	-12.7	-2.7
10 th grade	41.2%	50.1%	40.8%	43.3%	42.4%	39.4%	-1.8	-3.0
11 th grade	46.3%	50.0%	50.6%	50.5%	50.9%	47.3%	1.0	-3.6
12 th grade	56.8%	53.0%	57.7%	55.3%	55.3%	50.6%	-6.2	-4.7
Total	30.3%	29.6%	28.6%	29.3%	29.8%	26.9%	-3.4	-2.9
Cigarettes								
6 th grade	24.4%	22.1%	14.1%	16.5%	11.5%	9.2%	-15.2	-2.3
7 th grade	38.4%	39.1%	25.8%	25.9%	19.1%	16.1%	-22.3	-3.0
8 th grade	54.0%	51.4%	40.6%	34.7%	30.6%	25.5%	-28.5	-5.1
9 th grade	61.6%	58.9%	49.5%	46.0%	39.2%	31.9%	-29.7	-7.3
10 th grade	65.1%	67.7%	57.2%	55.1%	47.0%	38.9%	-26.2	-8.1
11 th grade	64.4%	69.3%	61.3%	60.8%	53.6%	43.7%	-20.7	-9.9
12 th grade	73.3%	67.7%	68.1%	63.8%	57.3%	46.8%	-26.5	-10.5
Total	52.8%	50.2%	44.6%	42.6%	36.9%	30.3%	-22.5	-6.6
Inhalants								
6 th grade	12.4%	12.9%	11.7%	10.8%	9.7%	10.1%	-2.3	0.4
7 th grade	21.5%	23.1%	14.1%	13.4%	13.4%	11.5%	-10.0	-1.9
8 th grade	29.6%	23.4%	19.6%	14.5%	15.0%	15.3%	-14.3	0.3
9 th grade	21.5%	22.0%	16.6%	14.4%	12.8%	14.1%	-7.4	1.3
10 th grade	20.4%	22.2%	15.5%	13.9%	11.7%	12.0%	-8.4	0.3
11 th grade	18.0%	15.5%	14.0%	12.1%	11.5%	11.1%	-6.9	-0.4
12 th grade	16.8%	13.8%	14.1%	12.8%	10.6%	9.3%	-7.5	-1.3
Total	20.8%	19.6%	15.2%	13.2%	12.2%	12.0%	-8.8	-0.2
Cocaine								
6 th grade	1.4%	2.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.1%	-0.3	-0.2
7 th grade	2.9%	4.2%	1.6%	2.0%	2.4%	1.7%	-1.2	-0.7
8 th grade	5.7%	5.6%	3.3%	3.8%	3.9%	3.1%	-2.6	-0.8
9 th grade	5.1%	5.5%	4.6%	4.9%	4.2%	4.3%	-0.8	0.1
10 th grade	5.9%	6.9%	5.3%	6.0%	5.9%	6.0%	0.1	0.1
11 th grade	4.8%	4.3%	6.3%	6.7%	7.5%	7.7%	2.9	0.2
12 th grade	10.9%	5.1%	7.3%	8.0%	8.3%	8.6%	-2.3	0.3
Total	4.9%	4.7%	4.2%	4.6%	4.8%	4.6%	-0.3	-0.2

Table 8: Prevalence of Lifetime Substance Use among the Maine Student Population in Grades 6-12: 1995-2004. (Continued)

	LIFETIME USE						Percentage Point Change	
	1995	1996	1998/9	2000	2002	2004	Since 1995	Since 2002
LSD/Psychedelics								
6 th grade	1.9%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%	-1.2	-0.2
7 th grade	4.0%	5.0%	1.2%	1.8%	2.0%	1.2%	-2.8	-0.8
8 th grade	9.0%	8.1%	3.3%	4.1%	4.0%	2.9%	-6.1	-1.1
9 th grade	11.5%	10.0%	7.5%	6.9%	5.3%	4.4%	-7.1	-0.9
10 th grade	10.2%	15.9%	9.4%	11.1%	7.5%	6.4%	-3.8	-1.1
11 th grade	14.5%	13.5%	13.4%	13.3%	10.5%	7.6%	-6.9	-2.9
12 th grade	23.0%	15.0%	16.2%	17.2%	11.4%	8.8%	-14.2	-2.6
Total	9.7%	8.6%	7.2%	7.7%	5.9%	4.6%	-5.1	-1.3
MDMA/Ecstasy								
6 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.8%	0.7%	N/A	-0.1
7 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.0%	1.1%	N/A	-0.9
8 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.4%	2.9%	N/A	-1.5
9 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.2%	3.8%	N/A	-2.4
10 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.5%	5.1%	N/A	-3.4
11 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.1%	6.6%	N/A	-4.5
12 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12.5%	7.3%	N/A	-5.2
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.5%	3.9%	N/A	-2.6
Heroin								
6 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.9%	0.7%	N/A	-0.2
7 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.8%	0.9%	N/A	-0.9
8 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.5%	1.8%	N/A	-0.7
9 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.5%	2.3%	N/A	-0.2
10 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.8%	2.9%	N/A	0.1
11 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.6%	3.0%	N/A	-0.6
12 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.4%	2.5%	N/A	-0.9
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.5%	2.0%	N/A	-0.5
Prescription Drugs¹								
6 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.2%	N/A	N/A
7 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.9%	N/A	N/A
8 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13.2%	N/A	N/A
9 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.5%	N/A	N/A
10 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22.1%	N/A	N/A
11 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	24.6%	N/A	N/A
12 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22.3%	N/A	N/A
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16.6%	N/A	N/A
Stimulants								
6 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	N/A	-0.1
7 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.5%	1.5%	1.1%	N/A	-0.4
8 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.7%	3.2%	2.4%	N/A	-0.8
9 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.7%	4.3%	3.8%	N/A	-0.5
10 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.9%	5.6%	5.7%	N/A	0.1
11 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.9%	7.8%	6.5%	N/A	-1.3
12 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.6%	7.2%	6.4%	N/A	-0.8
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.8%	4.4%	3.8%	N/A	-0.6

¹ Prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student. In the 2002 MYDAUS, OxyContin use was asked separately; therefore, the data are not comparable.

² There was a slight wording difference in the stimulant question in the 2004/2002 surveys versus the 2000 survey (see p.24).

Table 9: Prevalence of Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population in Grades 6-12: 1995-2004.

	PREVIOUS 30-DAY USE						Percentage Point Change	
	1995	1996	1998/9	2000	2002	2004	Since 1995	Since 2002
Alcohol								
6 th grade	11.4%	9.6%	7.7%	8.1%	7.0%	6.7%	-4.7	-0.3
7 th grade	23.6%	25.4%	14.4%	16.1%	12.7%	12.1%	-11.5	-0.6
8 th grade	36.4%	35.6%	25.2%	24.8%	22.9%	22.4%	-14.0	-0.5
9 th grade	45.0%	43.7%	34.4%	34.6%	32.1%	32.5%	-12.5	0.4
10 th grade	49.6%	51.0%	39.5%	41.5%	38.4%	40.3%	-9.3	1.9
11 th grade	52.7%	52.0%	47.4%	43.4%	44.8%	45.2%	-7.5	0.4
12 th grade	60.7%	59.1%	53.2%	50.6%	48.4%	49.2%	-11.5	0.8
Total	38.0%	35.7%	31.1%	30.8%	29.5%	29.7%	-8.3	0.2
Marijuana								
6 th grade	2.3%	1.7%	1.2%	2.2%	1.4%	1.4%	-0.9	0.0
7 th grade	7.4%	8.6%	3.2%	4.4%	4.2%	3.4%	-4.0	-0.8
8 th grade	16.0%	17.3%	8.2%	10.0%	10.6%	7.9%	-8.1	-2.7
9 th grade	28.1%	21.1%	18.5%	16.5%	17.0%	15.6%	-12.5	-1.4
10 th grade	27.9%	33.2%	22.7%	23.7%	24.2%	22.5%	-5.4	-1.7
11 th grade	28.9%	30.5%	28.5%	25.7%	29.2%	25.8%	-3.1	-3.4
12 th grade	35.8%	28.6%	30.4%	29.3%	28.4%	26.8%	-9.0	-1.6
Total	19.4%	17.7%	15.7%	15.6%	16.5%	14.8%	-4.6	-1.7
Cigarettes¹								
6 th grade	6.1%	5.6%	3.3%	4.0%	2.8%	3.1%	-3.0	0.3
7 th grade	15.4%	17.7%	8.2%	8.4%	5.5%	5.9%	-9.5	0.4
8 th grade	23.9%	23.5%	13.6%	13.1%	11.5%	10.8%	-13.1	-0.7
9 th grade	31.8%	29.3%	21.2%	18.2%	15.1%	15.6%	-16.2	0.5
10 th grade	32.5%	37.1%	25.2%	23.1%	19.4%	19.2%	-13.3	-0.2
11 th grade	34.5%	39.0%	30.9%	26.3%	23.9%	22.2%	-12.3	-1.7
12 th grade	40.6%	33.2%	35.8%	30.4%	26.1%	24.8%	-15.8	-1.3
Total	25.1%	24.2%	19.3%	17.2%	14.9%	14.6%	-10.5	-0.3
Inhalants								
6 th grade	6.0%	6.6%	5.6%	4.4%	4.8%	5.3%	-0.7	0.5
7 th grade	11.0%	11.9%	5.8%	6.6%	6.3%	6.1%	-4.9	-0.2
8 th grade	16.6%	11.4%	8.3%	6.5%	6.8%	7.6%	-9.0	0.8
9 th grade	7.2%	8.9%	5.9%	4.8%	4.4%	5.7%	-1.5	1.3
10 th grade	5.3%	6.3%	3.8%	3.7%	3.7%	4.0%	-1.3	0.3
11 th grade	5.0%	4.2%	2.6%	2.8%	2.8%	3.3%	-1.7	0.5
12 th grade	4.3%	2.5%	2.7%	2.4%	2.7%	2.1%	-2.2	-0.6
Total	8.7%	8.3%	5.1%	4.5%	4.5%	4.9%	-3.8	0.4
Cocaine								
6 th grade	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.5%	-0.3	-0.2
7 th grade	1.6%	1.4%	0.6%	1.0%	1.2%	0.7%	-0.9	-0.5
8 th grade	2.3%	1.9%	1.2%	2.0%	2.1%	1.5%	-0.8	-0.6
9 th grade	2.5%	2.5%	1.7%	1.8%	1.7%	1.9%	-0.6	0.2
10 th grade	2.0%	1.0%	1.4%	1.8%	2.4%	2.6%	0.6	0.2
11 th grade	1.5%	1.0%	1.7%	2.3%	3.1%	3.1%	1.6	0.0
12 th grade	2.3%	2.3%	1.6%	2.6%	3.1%	3.6%	1.3	0.5
Total	1.9%	1.5%	1.3%	1.7%	2.0%	2.0%	0.1	0.0

¹ Wording of past-month cigarette use was slightly different in the 2004 survey than in previous MYDAUS surveys (see p.22).

Table 9: Prevalence of Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population in Grades 6-12: 1995-2004. (Continued)

	PREVIOUS 30-DAY USE						Percentage Point Change	
	1995	1996	1998/9	2000	2002	2004	Since 1995	Since 2002
LSD/Psychedelics								
6 th grade	1.2%	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	-0.6	-0.1
7 th grade	2.2%	2.5%	0.8%	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	-1.4	-0.4
8 th grade	3.6%	4.0%	1.6%	2.1%	2.3%	1.6%	-2.0	-0.7
9 th grade	6.6%	4.8%	3.6%	3.2%	2.5%	2.4%	-4.2	-0.1
10 th grade	4.8%	6.2%	3.5%	3.8%	2.9%	3.2%	-1.6	0.3
11 th grade	5.7%	5.1%	4.5%	4.5%	3.7%	3.1%	-2.6	-0.6
12 th grade	6.8%	5.2%	5.0%	4.4%	2.6%	3.2%	-3.6	0.6
Total	4.2%	3.7%	2.7%	2.8%	2.3%	2.2%	-2.0	-0.1
MDMA/Ecstasy								
6 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.5%	0.4%	N/A	-0.1
7 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.1%	0.6%	N/A	-0.5
8 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.6%	1.4%	N/A	-1.2
9 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.7%	1.8%	N/A	-0.9
10 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.5%	1.7%	N/A	-1.8
11 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.2%	2.1%	N/A	-2.1
12 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.4%	1.6%	N/A	-1.8
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.6%	1.4%	N/A	-1.2
Heroin								
6 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.5%	0.4%	N/A	-0.1
7 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.9%	0.6%	N/A	-0.3
8 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.4%	1.0%	N/A	-0.4
9 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.0%	1.1%	N/A	0.1
10 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.4%	1.4%	N/A	0.0
11 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.5%	1.4%	N/A	-0.1
12 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.2%	1.0%	N/A	-0.2
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.1%	1.0%	N/A	-0.1
Prescription Drugs¹								
6 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.8%	N/A	N/A
7 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.7%	N/A	N/A
8 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.1%	N/A	N/A
9 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.9%	N/A	N/A
10 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.0%	N/A	N/A
11 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.6%	N/A	N/A
12 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.3%	N/A	N/A
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.8%	N/A	N/A
Stimulants²								
6 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	N/A	-0.1
7 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	N/A	-0.1
8 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.1%	1.8%	1.2%	N/A	-0.6
9 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.6%	2.0%	1.6%	N/A	-0.4
10 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.7%	2.5%	2.7%	N/A	0.2
11 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.6%	3.5%	2.8%	N/A	-0.7
12 th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.8%	2.5%	2.7%	N/A	0.2
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.0%	1.9%	1.7%	N/A	-0.2

¹ Prescription drugs not specifically prescribed for the student. In the 2002 MYDAUS, OxyContin use was asked separately; therefore, the data are not comparable.

² There was a slight wording difference in the stimulant question in the 2004/2002 surveys versus the 2000 survey (see p.24).

II. SUBSTANCE USE

Cigarettes – Lifetime Use

- The prevalence rates of lifetime cigarette use have decreased steadily since 1995 (from 52.8% in 1995 to 30.3% in 2004). There has been a 22.5 percentage point reduction in lifetime cigarette use since 1995 and a 6.6 percentage point decrease since 2002 (36.9%).
- Since 1995, all grades have experienced a reduction in lifetime cigarette use of between 15 and 30 percentage points. Since 2002, the most dramatic reduction in use was among 12th graders (-10.5 percentage points) and 11th graders (-9.9 percentage points).

Cigarettes – Past-month Use

- There has been a 10.5 percentage point reduction in the prevalence of past-month cigarette use¹ since 1995 (from 25.1% in 1995 to 14.6% in 2004).
- Substantial reductions in past-month use of cigarettes were seen across all grades when compared with 1995 data, although there has been little change since 2002.

Inhalants – Lifetime Use

- There has been an 8.8 percentage point reduction in the prevalence of lifetime inhalant use since 1995 (from 20.8% in 1995 to 12.0% in 2004), but the rate has remained steady since 2002 (12.2%).
- Substantial reductions for lifetime inhalant use were seen across all grades when compared with 1995 data; however, the only notable decrease since 2002 occurred in grade 7 (-1.9 percentage points).

Inhalants – Past-month Use

- There has been a 3.8 percentage point reduction in the prevalence of past-month inhalant use since 1995 (from 8.7% in 1995 to 4.9% in 2004). Similar to the findings related to lifetime inhalant use, the overall prevalence rate of past-month inhalant use has remained steady since 2002 (4.5%).
- The largest decreases in past-month use of inhalants since 1995 occurred among students in grade 8 (-9.0 percentage points) and grade 7 (-4.9 percentage points).

¹ A different question was used to define past-month cigarette use in the 2004 survey. In 2004, the question read as follows: "During the past 30 days, on the days that you smoked, how many cigarettes did you smoke per day?" In previous MYDAUS surveys, the question was, "How frequently have you smoked cigarettes during the past 30 days?"

II. SUBSTANCE USE

Cocaine – Lifetime Use

- The overall prevalence of lifetime use of cocaine has remained mostly unchanged since 1995. However, in that time, lifetime cocaine use for 11th graders increased by 2.9 percentage points (from 4.8% in 1995 to 7.7% in 2004) while the rate for 8th grade students has decreased by 2.6 percentage points (from 5.7% in 1995 to 3.1% in 2004).

Cocaine – Past-month Use

- The overall prevalence rate of past-month use of cocaine has remained between 1.3% and 2.0% over the past decade.
- Broken down by grade, use since 1995 has decreased in the 9th and lower grades, but has increased in grades 10 through 12. This is especially apparent in the 11th grade, where use has increased from 1.5% in 1995 to 3.1% in 2002 and 2004, and 12th grade which experienced an increase from 2.3% to 3.6% from 1995 to 2004.

LSD – Lifetime Use

- There has been a 5.1 percentage point reduction in the prevalence of lifetime LSD use since 1995 (from 9.7% in 1995 to 4.6% in 2004), and a 1.3 percentage point decrease since 2002 (5.9%).
- Decreases were observed in all grades, but the largest decrease in lifetime use occurred among 12th graders, 14.2 percentage points between 1995 (23.0%) and 2004 (8.8%). Since 2002, the largest decreases in use were seen among students in grade 11 (-2.9 percentage points) and grade 12 (-2.6 percentage points).

LSD – Past-month Use

- There has been a 2.0 percentage point reduction in the prevalence of past-month LSD use since 1995 (from 4.2% in 1995 to 2.2% in 2004), but the rate has remained steady since 2002 (2.3%).
- Again, decreased use was observed in all grades, but the largest reductions since 1995 were found in among students in the 9th grade (-4.2 percentage points), 12th grade (-3.6 percentage points), and 11th grade (-2.6 percentage points).

II. SUBSTANCE USE

MDMA/Ecstasy – Lifetime Use¹

- There has been a 2.6 percentage point reduction in the prevalence of lifetime Ecstasy use since 2002 (from 6.5% in 2002 to 3.9% in 2004).
- The largest decreases in lifetime Ecstasy use were seen among students in the 12th grade (-5.2 percentage points), 11th grade (-4.5 percentage points), and 10th grade (-3.4 percentage points).

MDMA/Ecstasy – Past-month Use¹

- There has been a 1.2 percentage point reduction in the prevalence of past-month Ecstasy use since 2002 (from 2.6% in 2002 to 1.4% in 2004).
- Although there has been a decrease in reported use among all grades, the most notable decrease was among 11th grade students (from 4.2% in 2002 to 2.1% in 2004). However, prevalence rates are still highest in this grade.

Heroin – Lifetime Use¹

- There was an overall decrease in the prevalence of lifetime heroin use from 2002 (2.5%) to 2004 (2.0%).
- In 2004, lifetime heroin use was highest among 11th graders (3.0%) and 10th graders (2.9%).

Heroin – Past-month Use¹

- The prevalence of past-month heroin use since 2002 has essentially remained the same (from 1.1% in 2002 to 1.0% in 2004).

Stimulants – Lifetime Use²

- There was an overall decrease in the prevalence of lifetime stimulant use from 2002 (4.4%) to 2004 (3.8%).
- In 2004, lifetime stimulant use was highest among 11th graders (6.5%) and 12th graders (6.4%).

Stimulants – Past-month Use²

- The prevalence of past-month stimulant use since 2002 has essentially remained the same (from 1.9% in 2002 to 1.7% in 2004).

¹ These questions were first asked in 2002.

² In 2004 and 2002, the stimulant questions read as follows: "On how many occasions (if any) have you used stimulants ("amphetamines", "meth", "crystal", "crank") in your lifetime / during the past 30 days?" In the 2000 MYDAUS, the questions were: "On how many occasions (if any) have you used stimulants ("amphetamines", "meth", "crystal", "crank", "speed") in your lifetime / during the past 30 days?"

II. SUBSTANCE USE

F. Substance Use – Differences between Maine and the U.S.

In order to provide a broader perspective on the rates of substance abuse among Maine students, the MYDAUS results were compared to those from the 2004 “Monitoring the Future” (MTF) Study, a national survey conducted by the University of Michigan. MTF is an ongoing study of the behaviors, attitudes, and values of American secondary school students, college students, and young adults. Each year, a random sample totaling approximately 48,500 students in the eighth, tenth, and twelfth grades are surveyed, which provides a reliable sample for comparison. *However, MTF’s sample includes private schools, while the schools participating in the MYDAUS have at least 60% publicly funded students. Because the MYDAUS and MTF surveys employ different methodologies, it is important to use caution when comparing the results.*

MYDAUS results for the following substances were lower than MTF results (see the light green shaded cells in Tables 10 and 11):

- Lifetime use of alcohol (12th grade) and binge drinking (5 or more drinks in one sitting) in the two weeks prior to the survey (8th grade)
- Lifetime use of marijuana (8th grade)
- Lifetime use of cigarettes (8th, 10th and 12th grades)
- Lifetime use of smokeless tobacco (8th and 10th grades); past-month use of smokeless tobacco (8th grade)
- Lifetime use of inhalants (8th and 12th grade)
- Lifetime use of psychedelics (8th grade)
- Lifetime and past-month use of stimulants (8th, 10th and 12th grades)

Students taking the MYDAUS had higher prevalence rates than the national average for the following substances (see the light red shaded cells in Tables 10 and 11):

- Past-month use of alcohol (8th and 10th grades)
- Lifetime use of marijuana (10th and 12th grades); past-month use of marijuana (8th, 10th and 12th grades)
- Past-month use of cigarettes (8th and 10th grades)
- Lifetime use of MDMA/Ecstasy (10th grade); past-month use of MDMA/Ecstasy (8th and 10th grades)
- Past-month use of inhalants (8th, 10th and 12th grades)
- Lifetime use of heroin (10th and 12th grades); past-month use of heroin (8th, 10th and 12th grades)
- Past-month use of psychedelics (8th, 10th and 12th grades)

II. SUBSTANCE USE

Prevalence rates for the following substances were approximately equal in both the MYDAUS and MTF surveys:

- Heavy use of alcohol – binge drinking (5 or more drinks in one sitting) in the two weeks prior to the survey (10th and 12th grades)
- Heavy use of smokeless tobacco (at least once daily in the 30 days prior to the survey) (8th, 10th and 12th grades)
- Lifetime use of alcohol (8th and 10th grades); past-month use of alcohol (12th grade)
- Past-month use of cigarettes (12th grade)
- Lifetime use of smokeless tobacco (12th grade); past-month use of smokeless tobacco (10th and 12th grades)
- Lifetime use of MDMA/Ecstasy (8th and 12th grades); past-month use of MDMA/Ecstasy (12th grade)
- Lifetime use of inhalants (10th grade)
- Lifetime use of heroin (8th grade)
- Lifetime use of psychedelics (10th and 12th grades)

Table 10: Prevalence of Heavy Substance Use among the Maine Student Population versus the National Student Population: 2004

		HEAVY USE	
		MYDAUS	MTF ¹
BINGE DRINKING (PREVIOUS 2 WEEKS)	8 th grade	9.2%	11.4%
	10 th grade	21.7%	22.0%
	12 th grade	29.0%	29.2%
SMOKELESS TOBACCO (AT LEAST ONCE DAILY IN PAST 30 DAYS)	8 th grade	0.9%	1.0%
	10 th grade	1.6%	1.6%
	12 th grade	2.6%	2.8%

¹ Monitoring the Future (MTF) Study, the University of Michigan, 2004.

Table 11: Prevalence of Lifetime and Past Month Substance Use among the Maine Student Population versus the National Student Population: 2004

		LIFETIME		PAST MONTH	
		MYDAUS	MTF ¹	MYDAUS	MTF ¹
ALCOHOL	8 th grade	42.7%	43.9%	22.4%	18.6%
	10 th grade	64.8%	64.2%	40.3%	35.2%
	12 th grade	75.6%	76.8%	49.2%	48.0%
MARIJUANA	8 th grade	14.8%	16.3%	7.9%	6.4%
	10 th grade	39.4%	35.1%	22.5%	15.9%
	12 th grade	50.6%	45.7%	26.8%	19.9%
CIGARETTES	8 th grade	25.5%	27.9%	10.8%	9.2%
	10 th grade	38.9%	40.7%	19.2%	16.0%
	12 th grade	46.8%	52.8%	24.8%	25.0%
SMOKELESS TOBACCO	8 th grade	7.6%	11.0%	3.1%	4.1%
	10 th grade	12.5%	13.8%	5.5%	4.9%
	12 th grade	17.7%	16.7%	7.3%	6.7%
MDMA (ECSTASY)	8 th grade	2.9%	2.8%	1.4%	0.8%
	10 th grade	5.1%	4.3%	1.7%	0.8%
	12 th grade	7.3%	7.5%	1.6%	1.2%
INHALANTS	8 th grade	15.3%	17.3%	7.6%	4.5%
	10 th grade	12.0%	12.4%	4.0%	2.4%
	12 th grade	9.3%	10.9%	2.1%	1.5%
HEROIN	8 th grade	1.8%	1.6%	1.0%	0.5%
	10 th grade	2.9%	1.5%	1.4%	0.5%
	12 th grade	2.5%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%
LSD/ PSYCHEDELICS ²	8 th grade	2.9%	3.5%	1.6%	1.0%
	10 th grade	6.4%	6.4%	3.2%	1.6%
	12 th grade	8.8%	9.7%	3.2%	1.9%
STIMULANTS/ AMPHETAMINES ³	8 th grade	2.4%	7.5%	1.2%	2.3%
	10 th grade	5.7%	11.9%	2.7%	4.0%
	12 th grade	6.4%	15.0%	2.7%	4.6%

¹ Monitoring the Future (MTF) Study, the University of Michigan, 2004.

² MYDAUS asked about use of “LSD or other psychedelics”; the Monitoring the Future Study asked about “hallucinogens”.

³ MYDAUS asked about use of “stimulants”; the Monitoring the Future Study asked about “amphetamines”.

III. RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS

Social research has identified numerous and interrelated factors that increase or decrease the probability of alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use and related problems among youths. These risk and protective factors are found at multiple levels, including the school, the individual and his/her peer group, the community, and the family (Hawkins et al., 1992; Kandel et al., 1986; Newcomb & Felix-Oriz, 1992). Identification of specific populations in which risk factors are high and protective factors are low permits identification of prevention needs and facilitates targeted programming toward the reduction of risk factors and the enhancement of protective factors (Hawkins et al., 1997).

Risk factors are characteristics of school, community, and family environments, and characteristics of students and their peer groups that are known to predict increased likelihood of drug use, delinquency, and violent behaviors among youth (Hawkins, Catalano & Miller, 1992; Hawkins, Arthur & Catalano, 1995; Brewer, Hawkins, Catalano & Neckerman, 1995; Lipsey & Derzon, 1998). For example, children who live in disorganized, crime-ridden neighborhoods are more likely to become involved in crime and drug use than children who live in safer neighborhoods.

Protective factors exert a positive influence or buffer against the negative influence of risk, thus reducing the likelihood that adolescents will engage in problem behaviors. Protective factors identified through research reviewed by the Social Development Research Group (SDRG), University of Washington, Seattle, include individual characteristics; social bonding to family, school, community and peers; and healthy beliefs and clear standards for behavior. For bonding to serve as a protective influence, it must occur through involvement with peers and adults who communicate healthy values and set clear standards for behavior.

The data for risk and protective factor scales are computed as cut-points. The cut-point for a risk scale is the point at which a score on the scale predicts negative outcomes. The cut-point of a protective factor scale is the point at which a score on the scale predicts positive outcomes. Cut-points were determined by dividing youth from a large seven-state data set (all using the survey) into two groups – those with high scores on negative survey outcome areas, and those with low scores in these same areas. Then, each risk factor scale was tested statistically to determine the point at which it significantly predicted membership in the group with high negative outcomes. Protective factor scales were treated in the same way, except they were tested to determine the point at which a scale significantly predicted membership in the group with low scores on the survey outcome areas. For example, approximately 46% of the students were at or above the cut point on the risk scale, “lower academic achievement”. This can be interpreted to mean that approximately 46% of the students showed a level of academic failure indicative of negative outcomes.

The following section outlines Maine students’ reported experience of risk and protective factors measured by the Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol Use Survey. Please note that percentages for risk factors represent the percent of students in each grade (6, 8, 10, and 12) who are at “elevated risk” or “elevated protection” in each noted factor because of student responses to particular questions associated with the indicators. See Appendix B for the definitions of the risk and protective factors and the questions associated with them.

III. RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS

A. Risk Factors

Table 12 illustrates that the greatest proportion (40.0% or more) of Maine students in the 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th grades are at risk due to the following factors:

- Low school commitment (49.6%)
- Attitudes favorable to antisocial behavior (47.6%)
- Sensation seeking (46.8%)
- Lower academic achievement (45.8%)
- Parental attitudes favor antisocial behavior (45.8%)
- Laws and norms favorable to drugs (43.9%)
- Rewards for antisocial involvement (43.4%)
- Poor family management (42.9%)
- Antisocial peers (42.7%)
- Intentions to use drugs (40.5%)

Students show more moderate levels of risk (30.0% to 39.9% “at risk”) for the following risk factors:

- Perceived availability of drugs (39.9%)
- Rebelliousness (39.9%)
- Perceived risk of drug use (39.2%)
- Family history of antisocial behavior (35.3%)
- Attitudes favorable to drug use (35.2%)
- Peers' drug use (35.1%)
- Parental attitudes favor drug use (32.5%)

Maine students are lowest on the following risk factors (less than 30.0% “at risk”):

- Early initiation of drug use (29.5%)
- Perceived availability of handguns (25.2%)

III. RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS

B. Protective Factors

The greatest proportion (60.0% or more) of Maine students in the 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th grades are protected due to the following factors (see Table 13):

- School opportunities for involvement (64.3%)
- Social skills (61.8%)
- Belief in the moral order (61.7%)

Students show more moderate levels of protection (50.0% to 59.9% “protected”) for the following protective factors:

- School rewards for pro-social involvement (59.2%)
- Family rewards for involvement (58.5%)
- Family opportunities for involvement (57.1%)
- Family attachment (53.6%)

Maine students are lowest on the following protective factors (less than 50.0% “protected”):

- Community opportunities for involvement (45.9%)
- Community rewards for involvement (43.0%)

C. Risk & Protective Factors – Differences by Grade

Tables 12 and 13 also illustrate that most risk and protective factors do not incrementally increase or decrease by grade. There are, however, several exceptions.

The following risk factors increase incrementally with grade:

- Perceived availability of drugs
- Parental attitudes favor drug use
- Perceived risk of drug use
- Rewards for antisocial involvement

Several risk factors increase from grades 6 through 10, but then drop in the 12th grade. These risk factors include:

- Family history of antisocial behavior
- Parental attitudes favor antisocial behavior
- Early initiation of drug use
- Attitudes favorable to drug use
- Antisocial peers
- Peers’ drug use
- Lower academic achievement

There are no protective factors that increase or decrease significantly and consistently with grade.

Table 12: Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by Grade, Gender, and Gender within Grade: 2004.

	6 th grade	8 th grade	10 th grade	12 th grade	Female	Male	6 th grade		8 th grade		10 th grade		12 th grade		State ¹
							F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
Laws and Norms Favorable to Drugs	37.6	37.8	50.5	49.5	39.6	47.7	33.9	41.4	34.5	41.0	45.5	55.3	44.8	53.7	43.9
Perceived Availability of Drugs	25.7	34.3	47.3	51.7	39.5	39.9	23.9	27.5	34.4	33.8	48.3	46.4	51.0	52.3	39.9
Perceived Availability of Handguns	19.8	35.6	20.9	24.2	20.8	29.7	16.1	23.2	32.4	38.9	15.9	25.8	17.4	30.7	25.2
Poor Family Management	34.4	42.8	46.4	47.2	38.2	47.5	28.8	39.9	39.2	46.5	42.5	50.2	41.1	53.5	42.9
Family History of Antisocial Behavior	29.2	34.4	39.9	37.2	36.9	33.3	30.5	28.0	37.4	30.9	41.4	37.8	37.5	36.5	35.3
Parental Attitudes Favor Drug Use	11.9	26.5	43.6	46.5	30.5	34.1	10.6	13.5	25.1	28.0	42.3	45.3	43.1	50.1	32.5
Parental Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	32.2	47.1	51.9	50.9	40.6	51.1	26.4	38.0	43.0	51.5	47.6	56.5	44.2	58.5	45.8
Lower Academic Achievement	43.3	48.6	50.4	40.2	40.7	50.3	37.8	48.4	44.1	53.0	45.8	54.1	34.2	45.3	45.8
Low School Commitment	48.0	50.6	51.7	48.0	42.5	56.3	39.8	55.3	44.3	57.2	45.1	57.7	40.4	55.0	49.6
Rebelliousness	42.2	36.7	42.9	37.6	34.3	45.3	36.3	47.7	32.9	40.2	38.8	46.8	28.7	46.6	39.9

Notes: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

¹ State average reflects data for the 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th grades only.

Table 12: Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by Grade, Gender, and Gender within Grade: 2004. (Continued)

	6 th grade	8 th grade	10 th grade	12 th grade	Female	Male	6 th grade		8 th grade		10 th grade		12 th grade		State ¹
							F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
Early Initiation of Drug Use	22.9	27.3	35.2	32.9	27.6	30.9	19.0	26.5	27.6	26.8	34.9	35.4	29.1	35.9	29.5
Attitudes Favorable to Antisocial Behavior	45.6	43.8	53.2	47.8	40.8	54.1	38.9	51.9	38.8	48.5	46.7	59.8	38.7	56.7	47.6
Attitudes Favorable to Drug Use	19.8	30.8	46.5	44.5	32.4	37.4	17.3	22.0	29.8	31.5	44.7	48.3	38.7	50.1	35.2
Perceived Risk of Drug Use	24.5	37.9	44.8	49.9	34.2	43.8	21.9	26.7	35.3	40.5	39.1	50.8	40.7	59.0	39.2
Antisocial Peers	28.2	44.5	49.9	48.3	34.9	49.8	20.3	35.4	36.1	52.7	43.4	56.2	40.0	56.1	42.7
Peers' Drug Use	19.6	35.3	45.5	40.2	34.5	35.3	18.9	20.1	36.5	33.8	45.6	45.6	36.9	43.3	35.1
Sensation Seeking	41.6	48.5	48.8	48.2	36.6	56.5	31.3	51.0	39.9	57.2	40.0	57.2	34.7	61.3	46.8
Rewards for Antisocial Involvement	23.7	41.5	49.1	60.2	44.1	42.4	23.2	24.3	43.6	39.3	50.0	48.4	60.8	60.1	43.4
Intentions to Use Drugs	46.8	33.2	47.2	34.6	38.0	42.9	43.9	49.8	32.4	33.7	45.5	48.8	30.1	39.4	40.5

Notes: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

¹ State average reflects data for the 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th grades only.

Table 13: Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “Protected” by Grade, Gender, and Gender within Grade: 2004.

	6 th grade	8 th grade	10 th grade	12 th grade	Female	Male	6 th grade		8 th grade		10 th grade		12 th grade		State ¹
							F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
Community Opportunities for Involvement	51.5	48.3	42.3	41.9	52.0	48.0	53.2	49.9	48.9	48.0	43.1	41.7	42.4	42.1	45.9
Community Rewards for Involvement	51.5	35.4	42.7	43.2	44.2	42.1	55.2	48.0	37.0	34.0	43.1	42.8	42.7	44.1	43.0
Family Attachment	59.3	51.4	45.3	59.8	53.0	54.4	57.9	60.9	50.3	52.8	44.9	46.1	60.6	58.8	53.6
Family Opportunities for Involvement	61.1	60.3	52.9	54.5	57.5	57.1	62.7	59.6	59.6	61.1	52.1	54.3	56.2	53.0	57.1
Family Rewards for Involvement	58.6	63.0	54.9	57.4	60.6	56.7	61.4	56.0	63.9	62.3	56.3	54.2	61.0	54.0	58.5
School Opportunities for Involvement	62.7	67.6	62.7	64.1	66.9	62.0	65.7	59.9	70.6	64.7	64.7	61.1	66.4	62.4	64.3
School Rewards for Pro-social Involvement	61.8	56.9	64.1	53.7	60.8	57.9	64.4	59.4	58.3	55.5	65.3	63.5	54.8	52.9	59.2
Social Skills	75.3	62.8	48.2	61.2	70.1	54.2	83.0	68.1	69.7	56.0	55.6	41.3	72.4	50.4	61.8
Belief in the Moral Order	65.0	62.2	64.5	54.4	71.3	52.5	73.9	56.8	70.1	54.6	72.6	56.7	68.5	40.5	61.7

Notes: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

¹ State average reflects data for the 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th grades only.

III. RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS

D. Risk & Protective Factors – Differences by Gender

Table 12 and 13 show that generally, risk factors are higher for male students than they are for female students. Exceptions to this are as follows:

The only risk factor where there is no significant difference by gender is “perceived availability of drugs”. Risk factors where females are more “at risk” than males are “family history of antisocial behavior” and “rewards for antisocial involvement”.

Female students are more “protected” than male students for each of the protective factors, with the exceptions of “family opportunities for involvement” for which there is no significant difference between genders, and “family attachment” where males are more “protected” than females overall.


E. Risk & Protective Factors – Differences by County

Tables 14 through 17 below show the breakdown of the risk and protective factors by county:

Table 14: Highest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by County: 2004.

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Laws and Norms Favorable to Drugs	41.0	41.4	39.3	50.2	48.0	41.5	52.6	49.3	50.8	44.4	46.4	49.2	49.5	51.0	48.6	40.3	43.9
Perceived Availability of Drugs	36.1	42.6	37.2	36.6	43.1	36.3	47.1	38.9	43.5	42.7	41.1	42.6	39.5	37.5	47.3	39.0	39.9
Perceived Availability of Handguns	22.0	29.8	19.7	28.2	31.4	24.0	29.0	24.2	30.1	27.9	29.4	24.6	26.9	27.7	34.5	22.1	25.2
Poor Family Management	44.1	40.0	43.6	42.1	42.5	41.9	47.2	44.9	45.0	40.3	44.3	47.5	43.0	44.9	40.5	42.6	42.9
Family History of Antisocial Behavior	33.7	34.4	31.6	36.6	41.2	32.7	44.4	39.0	42.4	35.1	39.8	36.6	38.6	37.1	41.3	32.6	35.3
Parental Attitudes Favor Drug Use	30.0	31.9	30.6	34.0	31.4	30.0	38.8	36.0	35.4	34.3	34.6	36.2	36.5	31.8	34.9	30.7	32.5
Parental Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	44.2	42.2	44.3	46.7	48.7	41.1	48.3	48.6	50.4	46.1	50.5	48.7	46.1	48.3	52.2	45.8	45.8
Lower Academic Achievement	48.7	43.4	43.9	45.5	48.5	46.1	44.7	46.3	49.1	43.0	48.5	47.2	46.1	49.0	48.8	46.1	45.8
Low School Commitment	49.7	48.9	48.8	50.0	49.7	50.4	56.6	53.4	53.0	48.5	47.5	52.4	42.9	51.1	52.3	49.1	49.6
Rebelliousness	42.8	37.3	38.4	40.3	39.3	38.1	48.1	42.2	42.1	39.9	39.8	42.2	38.7	42.4	38.5	39.3	39.9

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.

 Represents the county with the highest rate in each category



 Represents the counties with the second and third highest rates in each category

Table 14: Highest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by County: 2004. (Continued)

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Early Initiation of Drug Use	28.9	31.7	26.0	30.5	30.8	27.9	35.0	31.8	32.7	29.9	35.4	31.2	31.1	33.3	32.9	27.5	29.5
Attitudes Favorable to Antisocial Behavior	48.5	40.9	46.8	48.3	47.4	44.3	55.0	50.0	52.4	47.9	42.6	53.9	44.9	49.6	48.0	48.7	47.6
Attitudes Favorable to Drug Use	33.2	34.8	33.1	36.6	34.8	32.0	43.0	40.4	38.5	38.5	33.1	40.5	34.6	38.3	34.1	33.3	35.2
Perceived Risk of Drug Use	38.1	37.2	36.9	40.5	41.8	37.7	44.9	46.4	42.4	40.6	37.2	41.6	40.8	41.0	40.1	37.6	39.2
Antisocial Peers	44.9	39.8	39.7	40.5	42.7	41.9	45.1	43.1	43.2	42.6	43.7	46.7	46.6	44.0	48.7	42.8	42.7
Peers' Drug Use	33.1	35.4	33.7	34.6	36.0	33.2	40.1	40.2	37.5	37.3	34.9	37.8	34.1	36.2	35.1	34.0	35.1
Sensation Seeking	46.5	44.4	46.3	47.5	46.7	46.1	48.4	47.2	50.0	47.3	44.3	48.5	44.5	46.1	44.7	48.2	46.8
Rewards for Antisocial Involvement	40.7	43.2	43.0	44.1	45.5	40.1	49.7	47.4	43.3	46.6	42.1	48.3	42.9	41.3	43.1	41.8	43.4
Intentions to Use Drugs	37.7	36.5	40.7	42.5	41.1	37.6	47.9	43.7	44.1	39.4	37.0	46.0	38.2	39.9	40.8	41.8	40.5

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.

 Represents the county with the highest rate in each category



 Represents the counties with the second and third highest rates in each category

Table 15: Lowest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by County: 2004.

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Laws and Norms Favorable to Drugs	41.0	41.4	39.3	50.2	48.0	41.5	52.6	49.3	50.8	44.4	46.4	49.2	49.5	51.0	48.6	40.3	43.9
Perceived Availability of Drugs	36.1	42.6	37.2	36.6	43.1	36.3	47.1	38.9	43.5	42.7	41.1	42.6	39.5	37.5	47.3	39.0	39.9
Perceived Availability of Handguns	22.0	29.8	19.7	28.2	31.4	24.0	29.0	24.2	30.1	27.9	29.4	24.6	26.9	27.7	34.5	22.1	25.2
Poor Family Management	44.1	40.0	43.6	42.1	42.5	41.9	47.2	44.9	45.0	40.3	44.3	47.5	43.0	44.9	40.5	42.6	42.9
Family History of Antisocial Behavior	33.7	34.4	31.6	36.6	41.2	32.7	44.4	39.0	42.4	35.1	39.8	36.6	38.6	37.1	41.3	32.6	35.3
Parental Attitudes Favor Drug Use	30.0	31.9	30.6	34.0	31.4	30.0	38.8	36.0	35.4	34.3	34.6	36.2	36.5	31.8	34.9	30.7	32.5
Parental Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	44.2	42.2	44.3	46.7	48.7	41.1	48.3	48.6	50.4	46.1	50.5	48.7	46.1	48.3	52.2	45.8	45.8
Lower Academic Achievement	48.7	43.4	43.9	45.5	48.5	46.1	44.7	46.3	49.1	43.0	48.5	47.2	46.1	49.0	48.8	46.1	45.8
Low School Commitment	49.7	48.9	48.8	50.0	49.7	50.4	56.6	53.4	53.0	48.5	47.5	52.4	42.9	51.1	52.3	49.1	49.6
Rebelliousness	42.8	37.3	38.4	40.3	39.3	38.1	48.1	42.2	42.1	39.9	39.8	42.2	38.7	42.4	38.5	39.3	39.9

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.


 Represents the county with the lowest rate in each category

 Represents the counties with the second and third lowest rates in each category

Table 15: Lowest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “At Risk” by County: 2004. (Continued)

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Early Initiation of Drug Use	28.9	31.7	26.0	30.5	30.8	27.9	35.0	31.8	32.7	29.9	35.4	31.2	31.1	33.3	32.9	27.5	29.5
Attitudes Favorable to Antisocial Behavior	48.5	40.9	46.8	48.3	47.4	44.3	55.0	50.0	52.4	47.9	42.6	53.9	44.9	49.6	48.0	48.7	47.6
Attitudes Favorable to Drug Use	33.2	34.8	33.1	36.6	34.8	32.0	43.0	40.4	38.5	38.5	33.1	40.5	34.6	38.3	34.1	33.3	35.2
Perceived Risk of Drug Use	38.1	37.2	36.9	40.5	41.8	37.7	44.9	46.4	42.4	40.6	37.2	41.6	40.8	41.0	40.1	37.6	39.2
Antisocial Peers	44.9	39.8	39.7	40.5	42.7	41.9	45.1	43.1	43.2	42.6	43.7	46.7	46.6	44.0	48.7	42.8	42.7
Peers' Drug Use	33.1	35.4	33.7	34.6	36.0	33.2	40.1	40.2	37.5	37.3	34.9	37.8	34.1	36.2	35.1	34.0	35.1
Sensation Seeking	46.5	44.4	46.3	47.5	46.7	46.1	48.4	47.2	50.0	47.3	44.3	48.5	44.5	46.1	44.7	48.2	46.8
Rewards for Antisocial Involvement	40.7	43.2	43.0	44.1	45.5	40.1	49.7	47.4	43.3	46.6	42.1	48.3	42.9	41.3	43.1	41.8	43.4
Intentions to Use Drugs	37.7	36.5	40.7	42.5	41.1	37.6	47.9	43.7	44.1	39.4	37.0	46.0	38.2	39.9	40.8	41.8	40.5

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.

 Represents the county with the lowest rate in each category



 Represents the counties with the second and third lowest rates in each category

Table 16: Lowest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “Protected” by County: 2004.

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Community Opportunities for Involvement	43.5	49.8	48.4	42.5	49.8	48.7	46.1	43.1	43.1	48.0	45.0	42.1	40.4	45.2	42.0	43.2	45.9
Community Rewards for Involvement	39.1	48.6	42.1	40.8	47.1	41.5	44.4	46.9	40.6	46.4	47.5	41.1	43.4	45.0	48.8	38.9	43.0
Family Attachment	50.2	55.1	54.5	50.4	53.1	53.5	54.3	53.9	53.0	54.0	52.1	52.0	49.1	54.3	57.3	54.8	53.6
Family Opportunities for Involvement	55.0	59.0	57.4	56.6	57.5	57.3	56.5	54.9	55.7	57.4	55.5	53.8	56.0	55.9	60.7	58.0	57.1
Family Rewards for Involvement	54.0	61.5	59.8	54.1	59.3	58.6	55.0	54.8	57.4	58.8	59.0	58.6	57.5	55.7	62.0	59.3	58.5
School Opportunities for Involvement	66.6	64.0	65.9	59.3	66.7	60.8	61.4	57.0	64.8	65.5	60.4	58.6	65.4	61.1	63.5	65.6	64.3
School Rewards for Pro-social Involvement	60.7	59.2	61.1	55.3	62.7	56.6	54.7	57.5	55.8	60.1	59.6	56.2	60.7	57.4	63.8	58.6	59.2
Social Skills	60.3	64.4	62.8	61.1	61.5	64.9	58.5	58.9	59.5	61.7	63.9	56.5	61.6	60.6	63.6	61.6	61.8
Belief in the Moral Order	61.4	67.5	62.6	62.6	62.7	64.4	54.4	61.5	57.9	60.8	65.4	57.3	62.6	59.0	62.6	60.4	61.7

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.


 Represents the county with the **lowest** rate in each category


 Represents the counties with the second and third **lowest** rates in each category

Table 17: Highest Prevalence of the Maine Student Population (Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12) Considered to be “Protected” by County: 2004.

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Community Opportunities for Involvement	43.5	49.8	48.4	42.5	49.8	48.7	46.1	43.1	43.1	48.0	45.0	42.1	40.4	45.2	42.0	43.2	45.9
Community Rewards for Involvement	39.1	48.6	42.1	40.8	47.1	41.5	44.4	46.9	40.6	46.4	47.5	41.1	43.4	45.0	48.8	38.9	43.0
Family Attachment	50.2	55.1	54.5	50.4	53.1	53.5	54.3	53.9	53.0	54.0	52.1	52.0	49.1	54.3	57.3	54.8	53.6
Family Opportunities for Involvement	55.0	59.0	57.4	56.6	57.5	57.3	56.5	54.9	55.7	57.4	55.5	53.8	56.0	55.9	60.7	58.0	57.1
Family Rewards for Involvement	54.0	61.5	59.8	54.1	59.3	58.6	55.0	54.8	57.4	58.8	59.0	58.6	57.5	55.7	62.0	59.3	58.5
School Opportunities for Involvement	66.6	64.0	65.9	59.3	66.7	60.8	61.4	57.0	64.8	65.5	60.4	58.6	65.4	61.1	63.5	65.6	64.3
School Rewards for Pro-social Involvement	60.7	59.2	61.1	55.3	62.7	56.6	54.7	57.5	55.8	60.1	59.6	56.2	60.7	57.4	63.8	58.6	59.2
Social Skills	60.3	64.4	62.8	61.1	61.5	64.9	58.5	58.9	59.5	61.7	63.9	56.5	61.6	60.6	63.6	61.6	61.8
Belief in the Moral Order	61.4	67.5	62.6	62.6	62.7	64.4	54.4	61.5	57.9	60.8	65.4	57.3	62.6	59.0	62.6	60.4	61.7

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.

 Represents the county with the **highest** rate in each category

 Represents the counties with the second and third **highest** rates in each category

III. RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS

Table 18 illustrates that overall, the counties with the greatest number of high risk scores are Knox, Oxford, and Sagadahoc (see Table 14), and that the counties with the greatest number of low risk scores are Cumberland, Kennebec, Aroostook, and Androscoggin (see Table 15).

Table 18: Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence of Risk Factors: 2004.

	Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Highest</u> Risk Scores			Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Lowest</u> Risk Scores		
	1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ¹	1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ¹
Androscoggin	0	1	1	3	4	7
Aroostook	0	0	0	4	5	9
Cumberland	0	0	0	6	5	11
Franklin	0	0	0	0	2	2
Hancock	0	1	1	0	0	0
Kennebec	0	0	0	4	7	11
Knox	9	6	15	0	0	0
Lincoln	2	3	5	0	0	0
Oxford	2	10	12	0	0	0
Penobscot	0	0	0	1	2	3
Piscataquis	1	1	2	1	5	6
Sagadahoc	1	8	9	0	0	0
Somerset	0	2	2	1	1	2
Waldo	0	4	4	0	1	1
Washington	4	2	6	0	1	1
York	0	0	0	0	4	4

¹ The highest possible number per county is 19, as there are 19 risk factors.

III. RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS

Table 19 illustrates that overall, the counties with the greatest number of low protective scores are Androscoggin, Franklin, Lincoln, and Sagadahoc (see Table 16), and that the counties with the greatest number of high protective scores are Aroostook and Washington (see Table 17).

Table 19: Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence of Protective Factors: 2004.

	Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Lowest</u> Protective Scores			Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Highest</u> Protective Scores		
	1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ¹	1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ¹
Androscoggin	1	3	4	0	1	1
Aroostook	0	0	0	2	5	7
Cumberland	0	0	0	0	3	3
Franklin	0	4	4	0	0	0
Hancock	0	0	0	2	1	3
Kennebec	0	0	0	1	2	3
Knox	2	1	3	0	0	0
Lincoln	1	3	4	0	0	0
Oxford	0	3	3	0	0	0
Penobscot	0	0	0	0	0	0
Piscataquis	0	0	0	0	3	3
Sagadahoc	2	3	5	0	0	0
Somerset	2	0	2	0	0	0
Waldo	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	1	1	5	0	5
York	1	0	1	0	2	2

¹ The highest possible number per county is 9, as there are 9 protective factors.

F. Risk and Protective Factors – Differences between Maine and the U.S.

Table 20 shows the difference in perceived risk of cigarette smoking and marijuana and alcohol use between the Maine student population as quantified by the 2004 MYDAUS results, and U.S. students as measured through the MTF survey (2003). More Maine 8th graders but fewer 12th graders recognized the risk from smoking a pack or more of cigarettes per day than their counterparts in the rest of the country. Fewer of Maine's 10th and 12th graders than U.S. 10th and 12th graders felt that trying marijuana once or twice posed a "great risk" "physically or in other ways", and a smaller proportion of Maine students in all three grades felt smoking marijuana regularly posed a great risk. Conversely, a greater proportion of Maine students than U.S. students felt that drinking one or two alcoholic drinks daily posed a great risk. In general, the concern in Maine associated with the health affects of smoking marijuana and daily alcohol consumption decreased with age.

Table 20: Perceived Risk of Substance Use among the Maine Student Population versus the National Student Population: 2004

<i>(Percentage of students saying "great risk" from....)</i>			MYDAUS	MTF¹
Smoking one or more packs of cigarettes per day	8 th grade		64.7%	62.4%
	10 th grade		63.4%	68.4%
	12 th grade		64.4%	74.0%
Trying marijuana once or twice	8 th grade		32.6%	31.9%
	10 th grade		17.8%	22.0%
	12 th grade		13.4%	15.9%
Smoking marijuana regularly	8 th grade		69.2%	76.2%
	10 th grade		44.9%	65.6%
	12 th grade		37.7%	54.6%
Taking one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage (beer, wine or hard liquor) nearly every day	8 th grade		39.8%	31.0%
	10 th grade		32.7%	31.3%
	12 th grade		31.6%	23.0%

¹ Monitoring the Future (MTF) Study, the University of Michigan, 2004.

Table 21 shows that a smaller proportion of 8th, 10th and 12th graders in Maine feel marijuana and alcohol are "sort of easy" or "very easy" to obtain relative to their U.S. counterparts, and a significantly smaller proportion of 8th and 10th graders perceive cigarettes to be readily available.

Table 21: Perceived Availability of Substances by the Maine Student Population versus the National Student Population: 2004

<i>(Percentage of students saying "sort of easy" or "very easy" to get)</i>			MYDAUS	MTF¹
Marijuana	8 th grade		33.7%	41.0%
	10 th grade		70.1%	73.3%
	12 th grade		81.4%	85.8%
Alcohol	8 th grade		44.5%	64.9%
	10 th grade		67.4%	84.3%
	12 th grade		78.3%	94.2%
Cigarettes	8 th grade		42.0%	60.3%
	10 th grade		68.1%	81.4%
	12 th grade		88.1%	N/A

¹ Monitoring the Future (MTF) Study, the University of Michigan, 2004.

IV. PROHIBITED BEHAVIORS

In Maine, the most common prohibited behaviors 6th through 12th grade students have participated in within the last year are being drunk or high at school, attacking someone with the idea of seriously hurting them, and being suspended from school (see Table 22).

- Within the 12 months prior to the administration of the survey, 14.1% of students have been drunk or high at school, 12.7% have attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them, and 10.0% have been suspended from school.

Other prohibited behaviors that Maine students participated in within the 12 months preceding the survey include selling illegal drugs (7.2%) and being arrested (5.1%). In the year prior to the survey, less than four percent of students have stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle such as a car or motorcycle (3.1%), carried a handgun without permission (2.6%), or carried a handgun to school without permission (1.3%).

A. Prohibited Behaviors – Differences by Grade

Past-year prevalence rates of the following prohibited behaviors generally increase with grade, although some peak in either the 10th or 11th grade:

- Taking a handgun to school without permission (12th grade peak – 1.7%)
- Being drunk or high at school (11th grade peak – 23.8%)
- Selling illegal drugs (11th grade peak – 12.9%)
- Being arrested (10th grade peak – 7.2%)
- Stealing or trying to steal a motor vehicle (10th grade peak – 4.8%)

Prevalence rates for the other prohibited behaviors do not consistently increase with age:

- Attacking someone with the idea of seriously hurting them (9th grade peak – 14.8%)
- Being suspended from school (9th grade peak – 12.2%)
- Carrying a handgun without permission (9th grade peak – 3.1%)

B. Prohibited Behaviors – Differences by Gender

Table 22 also illustrates that prevalence rates for male students are significantly higher than those for female students for each of the prohibited behaviors:

- Being suspended from school (14.0% vs. 5.6%)
- Carrying a handgun without permission (4.3% vs. 0.7%)
- Selling illegal drugs (9.6% vs. 4.4%)
- Stealing or trying to steal a motor vehicle (4.3% vs. 1.7%)
- Being arrested (6.8% vs. 3.1%)
- Attacking someone with the idea of seriously hurting them (17.5% vs. 7.5%)
- Being drunk or high at school (15.4% vs. 12.1%)
- Taking a handgun to school without permission (2.0% vs. 0.4%)

Table 23 shows differences between genders within grade for prohibited behaviors.

Table 22: Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by Grade & Gender: 2004.

	6 th grade	7 th grade	8 th grade	9 th grade	10 th grade	11 th grade	12 th grade	Female	Male	State Average
Been suspended from school	6.0	8.4	12.0	12.2	11.5	10.7	8.8	5.6	14.0	10.0
Carried a handgun without permission	1.6	1.6	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.8	0.7	4.3	2.6
Sold illegal drugs	0.8	1.4	4.0	7.7	11.6	12.9	12.4	4.4	9.6	7.2
Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle	1.5	1.7	3.3	4.3	4.8	3.4	2.8	1.7	4.3	3.1
Been arrested	1.7	2.5	5.2	6.1	7.2	6.3	6.2	3.1	6.8	5.1
Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them	8.6	11.5	14.4	14.8	14.3	13.4	11.5	7.5	17.5	12.7
Been drunk or high at school	2.3	4.4	8.8	15.4	21.3	23.8	23.5	12.1	15.4	14.1
Taken a handgun to school without permission	0.7	0.7	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	0.4	2.0	1.3

Notes: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

Table 23: Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by Gender within Grade: 2004.


	6 th grade		7 th grade		8 th grade		9 th grade		10 th grade		11 th grade		12 th grade		State Avg.
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
Been suspended from school	2.4	9.2	3.7	12.9	6.9	17.1	7.7	16.2	7.4	15.3	6.3	14.5	4.5	12.7	10.0
Carried a handgun without permission	0.5	2.6	0.4	2.7	0.8	4.8	0.9	5.2	1.0	4.7	0.6	5.3	0.6	4.8	2.6
Sold illegal drugs	0.5	1.1	0.8	2.0	2.5	5.5	5.2	9.9	7.7	15.3	7.7	17.5	6.6	18.0	7.2
Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle	0.8	2.1	0.8	2.4	2.0	4.4	3.0	5.5	2.8	6.7	1.5	4.7	0.8	4.4	3.1
Been arrested	1.0	2.5	1.2	3.7	3.1	7.2	4.6	7.4	4.7	9.5	3.8	8.2	3.3	9.0	5.1
Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them	4.3	12.6	6.7	15.9	9.0	19.5	10.0	19.2	8.9	19.3	7.3	18.8	5.6	16.9	12.7
Been drunk or high at school	1.7	2.8	4.4	4.4	8.2	9.2	14.5	15.9	19.6	23.0	20.8	25.9	16.8	29.7	14.1
Taken a handgun to school without permission	0.3	1.0	0.2	1.1	0.4	1.7	0.6	2.1	0.4	2.7	0.3	2.6	0.3	2.9	1.3

Notes: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

Table 24: Highest Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Been suspended from school	10.3	9.4	9.0	10.2	10.9	10.0	9.9	9.8	9.7	10.0	11.4	11.9	11.3	11.0	12.2	9.9	10.0
Carried a handgun without permission	2.8	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.0	2.9	3.9	2.5	3.0	3.4	2.5	2.9	2.2	2.7	2.4	2.0	2.6
Sold illegal drugs	7.1	6.7	7.4	6.5	5.8	7.5	9.0	8.2	7.6	7.6	5.1	8.1	7.4	9.3	6.1	6.6	7.2
Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle	3.6	2.2	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.5	2.9	4.1	3.0	2.8	3.1
Been arrested	6.1	4.2	5.4	3.3	3.8	4.7	4.5	5.7	5.5	4.9	4.3	5.1	4.4	4.9	4.6	6.0	5.1
Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them	12.2	11.7	12.1	12.8	12.5	11.9	14.9	14.9	14.2	13.3	13.1	13.4	13.6	14.6	13.9	11.9	12.7
Been drunk or high at school	13.9	13.4	13.7	12.7	11.7	13.3	17.7	19.6	15.2	16.1	12.5	16.1	14.9	17.4	12.1	11.9	14.1
Taken a handgun to school without permission	1.4	1.0	1.3	1.5	0.8	1.7	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.0	1.3	0.8	1.0	1.3

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.


 Represents the county with the highest rate in each category

 Represents the counties with the second and third highest rates in each category

Table 25: Lowest Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Been suspended from school	10.3	9.4	9.0	10.2	10.9	10.0	9.9	9.8	9.7	10.0	11.4	11.9	11.3	11.0	12.2	9.9	10.0
Carried a handgun without permission	2.8	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.0	2.9	3.9	2.5	3.0	3.4	2.5	2.9	2.2	2.7	2.4	2.0	2.6
Sold illegal drugs	7.1	6.7	7.4	6.5	5.8	7.5	9.0	8.2	7.6	7.6	5.1	8.1	7.4	9.3	6.1	6.6	7.2
Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle	3.6	2.2	3.2	2.9	2.9	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.5	2.9	4.1	3.0	2.8	3.1
Been arrested	6.1	4.2	5.4	3.3	3.8	4.7	4.5	5.7	5.5	4.9	4.3	5.1	4.4	4.9	4.6	6.0	5.1
Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them	12.2	11.7	12.1	12.8	12.5	11.9	14.9	14.9	14.2	13.3	13.1	13.4	13.6	14.6	13.9	11.9	12.7
Been drunk or high at school	13.9	13.4	13.7	12.7	11.7	13.3	17.7	19.6	15.2	16.1	12.5	16.1	14.9	17.4	12.1	11.9	14.1
Taken a handgun to school without permission	1.4	1.0	1.3	1.5	0.8	1.7	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.0	1.3	0.8	1.0	1.3

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.

 Represents the county with the lowest rate in each category

 Represents the counties with the second and third lowest rates in each category

IV. PROHIBITED BEHAVIORS

C. Prohibited Behaviors – Differences by County

Tables 24 and 25 show the breakdowns of prohibited behaviors by county.

Table 26 below shows that overall, the counties with the greatest number of high prohibited behavior prevalence rates are Lincoln, Knox, and Waldo (see Table 24), and that the counties with the greatest number of low prohibited behavior prevalence rates are Aroostook, Hancock, and York (see Table 25).

Table 26: Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors: 2004.

	Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Highest</u> Prohibited Behavior Rates			Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Lowest</u> Prohibited Behavior Rates		
	1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ¹	1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ¹
Androscoggin	1	1	2	0	0	0
Aroostook	0	0	0	3	3	6
Cumberland	0	0	0	1	0	1
Franklin	0	1	1	1	1	2
Hancock	0	0	0	3	3	6
Kennebec	1	1	2	0	1	1
Knox	2	2	4	0	0	0
Lincoln	2	3	5	0	0	0
Oxford	1	1	2	0	1	1
Penobscot	0	1	1	0	0	0
Piscataquis	0	1	1	1	1	2
Sagadahoc	0	1	1	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0	0	0	2	2
Waldo	2	2	4	0	0	0
Washington	1	0	1	1	2	3
York	0	1	1	1	3	4

¹ The highest possible number per county is 8, as there are 8 different prohibited behaviors included in this analysis.

IV. PROHIBITED BEHAVIORS

D. Prohibited Behaviors – Differences by Year, 1995-2004

The MYDAUS was administered in 1995, 1996, 1998/9¹, 2000, 2002, and 2004. These earlier data provide important comparisons to the 2004 results for the purpose of monitoring any changes in prohibited behaviors over time among Maine middle and high school students (see Table 27). Although such comparisons can be useful, it is important to note that there have been significant changes in methodology throughout the history of the survey that may have impacted the results; therefore, any comparisons between the data should be made with caution (see Appendix A for a discussion of differences in survey methodologies).

There has been a decline in participation in all of the prohibited behaviors since the 1995 survey:

- Been suspended from school (decreased from 11.4% in 1995 to 10.0% in 2004)
- Carried a handgun (decreased from 5.2% to 2.6%)
- Sold illegal drugs (decreased from 8.6% to 7.2%)
- Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle (decreased from 3.9% to 3.1%)
- Been arrested (decreased from 6.4% to 5.1%)
- Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them (decreased from 14.5% to 12.7%)
- Been drunk or high at school (decreased from 16.0% to 14.1%)
- Taken a handgun to school (decreased from 2.1% to 1.3%)

Since 2002, there has also been a decrease in all the prohibited behaviors, except for “carrying a handgun without permission”, which hasn’t changed significantly (2.4% in 2002 and 2.6% in 2004) and “taking a handgun to school without permission” which has increased slightly (1.0% in 2002 to 1.3% in 2004).

¹ Administered during the fall of 1998 through the spring of 1999.

Table 27: Prevalence of Prohibited Behaviors During Previous Year among the Maine Student Population in Grades 6-12: 1995-2004.

	PAST YEAR PARTICIPATION						Percentage Point Change	
	1995	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	Since 1995	Since 2002
Been Suspended from School								
Total	11.4%	11.6%	8.8%	10.9%	10.5%	10.0%	-1.4	-0.5
Carried a Handgun¹								
Total	5.2%	4.3%	3.5%	4.2%	2.4%	2.6%	-2.6	+0.2
Sold Illegal Drugs								
Total	8.6%	7.9%	7.3%	7.3%	8.7%	7.2%	-1.4	-1.5
Stolen or Tried to Steal a Motor Vehicle								
Total	3.9%	3.4%	2.4%	3.0%	3.5%	3.1%	-0.8	-0.4
Been Arrested								
Total	6.4%	5.6%	4.5%	5.1%	5.5%	5.1%	-1.3	-0.4
Attacked Someone with the Idea of Seriously Hurting Them								
Total	14.5%	13.8%	11.5%	12.2%	14.0%	12.7%	-1.8	-1.3
Been Drunk or High at School								
Total	16.0%	16.0%	13.4%	13.7%	15.9%	14.1%	-1.9	-1.8
Taken a Handgun to School¹								
Total	2.1%	1.6%	0.8%	1.2%	1.0%	1.3%	-0.8	0.3

Note: Selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

¹ Due to the high prevalence of hunting in Maine, it is likely that many of the respondents who have "carried a handgun", did so with permission and/or under the supervision of an adult. Therefore, the survey instrument was changed in 2002 to ask about possession of handguns without permission. While this difference in wording most likely influenced the observed decrease in the proportion of student who reported having "carried a handgun", this change would not have had an effect on "taken a handgun to school" since it is highly unlikely that there would be circumstances under which a student would have permission to do so.

V. PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

Of the three pro-social behaviors included in the survey, the most common among Maine youth is participating in clubs, organizations, or activities at school (see Table 28). The next most common pro-social behavior among Maine students is doing extra work for school, followed by volunteering to do community service.

- Eight in ten (81.3%) 6th through 12th grade students in Maine participated in clubs, organizations, and activities at school in the year prior to taking the MYDAUS.
- Within the 12 months prior to the administration of the survey, 75.9% of students did extra work on their own for school, while 53.0% volunteered to do community service¹.

A. Pro-social Behaviors – Differences by Grade

Table 28 shows that prevalence rates for the pro-social behaviors included on the MYDAUS do not consistently increase with age, but rather have their own specific patterns:

- Participating in clubs, organizations, and activities at school – This behavior is mostly consistent from grade 6 through 12, with a low participation rate of 78.4% in the 10th grade and a high participation rate of 83.8% in the 7th grade.
- Doing extra work on their own for school – While this behavior decreases with age from 6th through 10th grade (80.7% among 6th graders to 72.1% among 10th graders), participation increases again among 11th (74.8%) and 12th (76.4%) graders.
- Volunteering to do community service – While this behavior decreases by grade in middle school, it increases by grade in high school, from a low of 44.0% among 8th graders to a high of 68.2% among 12th graders.

B. Pro-social Behaviors – Differences by Gender

Prevalence rates for female students are significantly higher than those for male students for each of the prohibited behaviors:

- Participating in clubs, organizations, and activities at school (85.9% versus 77.0%)
- Doing extra work on their own at school (82.6% versus 69.6%)
- Volunteering to do community service (61.8 versus 44.5%)

Table 29 shows differences between genders within grade for pro-social behaviors. The pattern of increased prevalence rates among female students holds true for each grade.

¹ Some Maine high schools are starting to require community service as a graduation requirement.

Table 28: Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by Grade & Gender: 2004.

	6 th grade	7 th grade	8 th grade	9 th grade	10 th grade	11 th grade	12 th grade	Female	Male	State Average
Participated in clubs, organizations, and activities at school	82.3	83.8	83.6	80.4	78.4	79.3	81.6	85.9	77.0	81.3
Done extra work on your own for school	80.7	79.0	75.7	73.3	72.1	74.8	76.4	82.6	69.6	75.9
Volunteered to do community service	51.4	46.3	44.0	49.6	53.7	60.0	68.2	61.8	44.5	53.0

Notes: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

Table 29: Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by Gender within Grade: 2004.


	6 th grade		7 th grade		8 th grade		9 th grade		10 th grade		11 th grade		12 th grade		State Avg.
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
Participated in clubs, organizations, and activities at school	86.8	78.3	88.7	79.0	88.5	79.0	84.7	76.5	83.1	73.9	83.5	75.3	86.2	77.6	81.3
Done extra work on your own for school	86.6	75.4	84.7	73.7	81.6	70.0	79.3	67.6	79.8	64.8	81.7	67.7	84.9	68.2	75.9
Volunteered to do community service	59.4	44.2	54.7	38.4	52.0	36.3	57.8	41.7	62.8	45.0	70.2	50.2	78.9	58.3	53.0

Notes: All numbers represent percent of students; selected columns are highlighted only to make the chart easier to read.

Table 30: Lowest Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Participated in clubs, organizations and activities at school	79.3	81.0	83.8	77.5	83.2	80.7	77.7	77.1	81.0	82.6	82.5	79.3	79.2	76.2	82.2	81.6	81.3
Done extra work on your own for school	74.2	74.4	78.4	75.8	75.7	74.3	75.8	75.0	75.2	75.5	75.1	73.2	76.9	72.4	74.1	77.4	75.9
Volunteered to do community service	50.7	51.6	57.8	54.2	53.1	54.1	52.3	49.1	51.1	50.7	61.7	48.1	49.3	52.4	48.0	54.5	53.0

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.


 Represents the county with the lowest rate in each category

 Represents the counties with the second and third lowest rates in each category

Table 31: Highest Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors in Past Year among the Maine Student Population by County: 2004.

	Andr	Aroo	Cumb	Fran	Hanc	Kenn	Knox	Linc	Oxfo	Peno	Pisc	Saga	Some	Wald	Wash	York	State
Participated in clubs, organizations and activities at school	79.3	81.0	83.8	77.5	83.2	80.7	77.7	77.1	81.0	82.6	82.5	79.3	79.2	76.2	82.2	81.6	81.3
Done extra work on your own for school	74.2	74.4	78.4	75.8	75.7	74.3	75.8	75.0	75.2	75.5	75.1	73.2	76.9	72.4	74.1	77.4	75.9
Volunteered to do community service	50.7	51.6	57.8	54.2	53.1	54.1	52.3	49.1	51.1	50.7	61.7	48.1	49.3	52.4	48.0	54.5	53.0

Note: All numbers represent percent of students.

 Represents the county with the highest rate in each category

 Represents the counties with the second and third highest rates in each category

V. PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

C. Pro-social Behaviors – Differences by County

Tables 30 and 31 show the breakdowns of pro-social behaviors by county.

Table 32 illustrates that overall, the counties with the greatest number of low pro-social behavior prevalence rates are Lincoln, Sagadahoc, Waldo, and Washington (see Table 30), and that the counties with the greatest number of high pro-social behavior prevalence rates are Cumberland and York (see Table 31).

Table 32: Counties with the Highest and Lowest Prevalence of Pro-social Behaviors: 2004.

	Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Lowest</u> Pro-social Behavior Rates				Number of Times County Ranked 1 st , 2 nd , or 3 rd for <u>Highest</u> Pro-social Behavior Rates		
	1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ¹		1 st	2 nd or 3 rd	Total ¹
Androscoggin	0	0	0		0	0	0
Aroostook	0	0	0		0	0	0
Cumberland	0	0	0		2	1	3
Franklin	0	1	1		0	0	0
Hancock	0	0	0		0	1	1
Kennebec	0	0	0		0	0	0
Knox	0	0	0		0	0	0
Lincoln	0	2	2		0	0	0
Oxford	0	0	0		0	0	0
Penobscot	0	0	0		0	1	1
Piscataquis	0	0	0		1	0	1
Sagadahoc	0	2	2		0	0	0
Somerset	0	0	0		0	1	1
Waldo	2	0	2		0	0	0
Washington	1	1	2		0	0	0
York	0	0	0		0	2	2

¹ The highest possible number per county is 3, as there are 3 different pro-social behaviors included in this analysis.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

A. Survey Instrument

The 2004 MYDAUS was adapted from the “Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors and Prevalence of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Use”, which was developed by the Social Development Research Group (SDRG) at the University of Washington. The SDRG questionnaire was originally developed for use in the Six-State Consortium (of which Maine was a member) for substance abuse prevention needs assessment studies sponsored by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP). The questionnaire was validated through a rigorous statistical analysis process to show that the results were indicative of the behaviors reported. Selected as a core needs assessment measure for CSAP’s state prevention needs assessment contracts, more than 22 states have conducted state-wide surveys using SDRG’s instrument.

In 2004 the MYDAUS was merged with the Maine Bureau of Health’s Youth Tobacco Survey to lessen the burden on participating schools. In order not to increase the length of the survey, the six Risk Factors and one Protective Factor listed below were deleted. In general, these were chosen because they were either the least closely correlated with prohibited behaviors or the least easily ameliorated through intervention.

Low Neighborhood Attachment
High Community Disorganization
Transitions and Mobility
High Family Conflict

Early Initiation of Prohibited Behavior
Gang Involvement
Religiosity (Protective Factor)

B. Sample Design

All public schools in Maine with any grades 6 through 12 were solicited to participate in the 2004 MYDAUS/YTS in order to provide local, objective data to schools applying for funds under the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act and/or One ME - Stand United for Prevention program. Every eligible school in Maine belonged to one of five major strata: 1) “Required” – that is, the school was “required” to take the survey based on involvement with OSA or BOH grants, 2) “MS sample” – these schools were not required to take the survey, but were selected as part of a random sample of non-required middle schools, 3) “HS sample” – these schools were not required to take the survey, but were selected as part of a random sample of non-required high schools, 4) “MS and HS sample” – these schools, spanning middle and high school grade levels, were not required to take the survey, but were selected as part of both the middle school random samples and high school random samples, 5) “Volunteer” – these schools were not required to take the survey nor were selected as part of either random sample, but nonetheless chose to participate. The weighting of the data was done by Market Decisions of Portland, Maine, and was designed to take into account the sampling methodology used during the course of data collection (see “Method of Weighting” section for more information).

C. School Recruitment Procedures

To help elicit school participation, the OSA and BOH sent a recruitment letter to all school superintendents in August of 2003. The recruitment letter briefly described the purpose of the survey and asked that superintendents and principals include the MYDAUS/YTS in their 2003-2004 school year survey schedule. Two different versions of the letter were sent – one to required schools indicating their school’s need to participate in the survey based on grant

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

obligations, and one to non-required schools encouraging their participation in the survey. Both letters also contained a very brief description of the survey and its content. A letter of intent fax-back form was enclosed with the recruitment letter. In addition to the letter, the staff at Pan Atlantic Consultants (PAC) contacted superintendents and principals (via phone, fax, and e-mail) to encourage participation. Principals who wanted the school to participate in the survey completed the form and faxed it back to PAC. The staff at PAC then contacted each individual school by phone to coordinate their participation in the survey.

D. Participation

Consent Procedures

Passive consent methodology was used for the 2004 MYDAUS/YTS. To obtain passive consent, participating schools were required to send an informational letter to parents via the U.S. mail. The letter conveyed the purpose and importance of the survey and encouraged participation. It also explained that the survey was anonymous, participation was voluntary, and results would only be presented in group-summary form. The letter informed parents that a copy of the survey instrument was on file at their child's schools if they wished to review it. Parents who wished to decline their child's participation were asked to notify the school. Any student whose parent letter was returned undeliverable was not surveyed. In order to be compliant with the No Child Left Behind Act, schools were asked that the letter be sent out at the beginning of the school year.

Within-School Sampling

The total school population in grades 6 through 12 was targeted in all participating schools. When this was not possible, as was the case in a few isolated schools, a random sample of students was drawn. Students whose parents did not give them permission to participate in the survey and/or did not themselves wish to participate in the survey were asked to sit quietly at their desks with an alternate activity during survey administration. Due to voluntary non-participation and absenteeism, the average attrition rate was approximately 23 % for passive consent in 2004.

E. Procedure

Data Collection and Confidentiality

Participating schools administered the survey during the week of February 9-13, 2004. In some cases, the schools administered the survey during a make-up session later in the semester. School staff members were given training as to how to administer the survey themselves. This was done primarily through group training sessions throughout the state.

Precautions were taken to protect the anonymity of individual students. First, student consent was required; that is, youths were asked to participate in the survey, informed of the confidentiality of their responses, and informed that their response was voluntary (i.e., they could refuse to answer any questions that they did not want to answer). Second, teachers were asked to remain seated during the administration of the survey. Third, students were asked to insert their completed questionnaires in a large envelope as it was passed around the room at the end of the survey period, and the last student sealed the envelope before handing it back to the teacher.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

Data Processing

After completed questionnaires were returned to PAC in Portland, Maine, the surveys were batched, scanned, and edited. Consistency checks were run to exclude careless, invalid, or logically inconsistent responses using syntax originally developed by the Social Development Research Group (SDRG). Surveys were excluded from the final analytical file if they met criteria that deemed them to be untruthful. The original data file included 78,260 records. Once the “honesty” syntax was run, a total of 3,095 records were excluded from the final analysis.

F. Margin of Error

The margin of error (MOE) is a measure of how precisely the proportion of students participating in the MYDAUS in a given geographic area represents all eligible students in that area. It is based on the number of participating students, the size of the student enrollment, the proportion of students who chose a response (a conservative 50/50 split is assumed in Table 33a), and the desired confidence level (in this case 95%).

MOEs are reported as plus or minus (\pm) percentages. As an example, if a county has a margin of error of $\pm 4\%$, and 50% of the responding students picked a particular response, you can be “95% sure” that if the question had been answered by the entire student population, between 46% (50% - 4%) and 54% (50% + 4%) would have picked that response. The smaller the margin of error, the more confidence we have that the results represents that of the whole student body. The margins of error for the county, region, and state levels for the 2004 survey are listed in Table 33a below.

Table 33a: Margins of Error for the 2004 MYDAUS by State, Region, and County: 2004.

	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	Total
Androscoggin	± 1.61	± 1.36	± 2.23	± 2.20	± 2.61	± 2.52	± 3.01	± 0.85
Aroostook	± 2.54	± 1.93	± 2.04	± 1.99	± 2.23	± 2.02	± 2.29	± 0.89
Cumberland	± 1.36	± 1.12	± 1.29	± 1.05	± 1.40	± 1.40	± 1.46	± 0.54
Franklin	± 3.38	± 2.92	± 2.81	± 3.71	± 4.14	± 4.34	± 7.18	± 1.71
Hancock	± 2.90	± 2.44	± 2.16	± 2.32	± 2.31	± 2.61	± 2.51	± 0.97
Kennebec	± 1.43	± 1.68	± 1.86	± 2.31	± 2.43	± 2.66	± 2.99	± 0.79
Knox	± 2.54	± 2.71	± 3.16	± 2.51	± 2.50	± 2.91	± 3.42	± 1.11
Lincoln	± 2.64	± 2.38	± 2.17	± 3.74	± 3.43	± 3.41	± 4.36	± 1.24
Oxford	± 1.69	± 1.78	± 1.63	± 2.29	± 2.47	± 3.08	± 3.05	± 0.83
Penobscot	± 1.43	± 1.33	± 1.38	± 2.09	± 2.27	± 2.32	± 2.48	± 0.83
Piscataquis	± 3.71	± 2.63	± 3.19	± 4.60	± 4.38	± 4.42	± 5.23	± 1.63
Sagadahoc	± 2.93	± 2.33	± 2.30	± 2.54	± 2.70	± 2.95	± 3.15	± 1.10
Somerset	± 2.03	± 2.69	± 2.39	± 2.56	± 2.29	± 2.36	± 2.94	± 1.06
Waldo	± 2.65	± 2.46	± 2.27	± 3.27	± 3.18	± 3.49	± 4.16	± 1.10
Washington	± 2.86	± 3.97	± 4.24	± 2.92	± 4.00	± 3.34	± 3.89	± 1.46
York	± 0.94	± 1.18	± 1.01	± 1.34	± 1.33	± 1.45	± 1.63	± 0.46
Region 1	± 0.85	± 0.81	± 0.82	± 0.83	± 1.01	± 1.02	± 1.09	± 0.37
Region 2	± 0.73	± 0.72	± 0.82	± 0.92	± 1.00	± 1.07	± 1.23	± 0.35
Region 3	± 1.12	± 1.01	± 1.05	± 1.22	± 1.34	± 1.33	± 1.43	± 0.49
Maine	± 0.50	± 0.48	± 0.52	± 0.57	± 0.64	± 0.66	± 0.73	± 0.23

Note: All numbers represent percentages.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

When the response proportions vary from the assumed 50%/50% split, the MOE decreases. Because very small proportions of students chose some of the responses on the MYDAUS (for instance, that they had used heroin in the last 30 days), we used more specific MOE calculations to detect statistically significant differences between two responses. As an example, if we want to know if significantly fewer of Maine's 10th graders had ever used inhalants in 2004 than have 10th graders in the US as a whole, we look at the proportion of 10th grade students in Maine who said they had used inhalants during their lifetime (12.0%), and add the margin of error for a 12% response among this group (0.4%), yielding an upper confidence limit of 12.4%. We compare this to the lower limit of the corresponding response by Monitoring the Future 10th graders (12.4% - 0.5%=11.9%). Because the Confidence Intervals for the two responses overlap, the difference between them is considered not to be significantly different. If, for instance, the response from MTF 10th graders had been 13.0% (13.0% - 0.5%=12.5%), we would consider Maine's inhalant use to be significantly lower. Table 33b shows the MOE for response proportions as divergent as 1%/99% (only the smaller proportion being shown.)

Table 33b: Margin of Error for Different Response Proportions, MTF and MYDAUS

		50%	30%	25%	20%	15%	12%	10%	7%	6%	5%	4%	3%	2%	1%
8th Grade	MTF 2004	±0.75	±0.69	±0.65	±0.60	±0.54	±0.49	±0.45	±0.38	±0.36	±0.33	±0.29	±0.26	±0.21	±0.15
	MYDAUS 2004	±0.51	±0.47	±0.44	±0.41	±0.37	±0.33	±0.31	±0.26	±0.24	±0.22	0.20	±0.17	±0.14	±0.10
10th Grade	MTF 2004	±0.76	±0.70	±0.66	±0.61	±0.55	±0.50	±0.46	±0.39	±0.36	±0.33	±0.30	±0.26	±0.21	±0.15
	MYDAUS 2004	±0.61	±0.56	±0.53	±0.49	±0.43	±0.40	±0.37	±0.31	±0.29	±0.27	±0.24	±0.21	±0.17	±0.12
12th Grade	MTF 2004	±0.81	±0.75	±0.70	±0.65	±0.58	±0.53	±0.49	±0.41	±0.38	±0.35	±0.32	±0.28	±0.23	±0.16
	MYDAUS 2004	±0.77	±0.71	±0.67	±0.62	±0.55	±0.50	±0.46	±0.40	±0.37	±0.34	±0.30	±0.26	±0.22	±0.15
Total	MYDAUS 2004	±0.22	±0.20	±0.19	±0.17	±0.15	±0.14	±0.13	±0.11	±0.10	±0.09	±0.08	±0.07	±0.06	±0.04
Total	MYDAUS 2002	±0.30	±0.27	±0.26	±0.24	±0.21	±0.19	±0.18	±0.15	±0.14	±0.16	±0.12	±0.10	±0.08	±0.06
Total	MYDAUS 1995	±1.09	±1.00	±0.95	±0.88	±0.78	±0.71	±0.66	±0.56	±0.52	±0.48	±0.43	±0.37	±0.31	±0.22

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

G. Method of Weighting

by Brian Robertson, PhD, Director of Research, Market Decisions, Portland, Maine

The weighting scheme applied to the MYDAUS/YTS data set was designed to take into account the sampling methodology used during the course of data collection. The weighting methodology had 5 primary phases:

1. Probabilistic weights – the base weight assigned based on the probability of selecting a school.
2. School non-response weighting adjustments – adjustments made to the base weights to factor in schools that chose not to participate.
3. Student non-response weighting adjustments – weights to adjust for survey non-response within schools, that is, to adjust for the students that did not take the survey within each participating school.
4. Within-school post-stratification weights – adjustments to weights within each school to normalize to the actual distribution by grade and gender where possible and to the total student population.
5. Geographic post-stratification weights – adjustments to weights within each county to normalize to the actual distribution by grade and gender and to the total number of students in each county.

Analysis of the data using these weights allows results to be generalized to the target population be it a school or another unit that involves more than one school.

The weighting process was followed sequentially, adjusting the base sample weights by stages to arrive at the final weights.

Base Sample Weight (Probabilistic Weight)

This is the base sample weight that reflects the probability that a school was selected to participate in the research. The base sample weight was calculated within each of the sample strata. In this research these strata are classified as:

- Required Program Schools
- High School Sample Schools
- Middle School Sample Schools
- High School/Middle School Sample Schools
- Volunteer Schools

Required program schools were those that were required to participate in the MYDAUS/YTS survey given agreements with the Office of Substance Abuse and Bureau of Health. Volunteer schools were those that were not required to participate and were not sampled but requested to participate in the survey process. Those listed as sample schools made up the remaining schools throughout the state, and among these schools, a random sample was drawn.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

The base sample weight was simply the inverse of the probability of selection.

Base Sample Weight (BW_i) = N_i/n_i

Where N_i represents the total number of schools in stratum i and n_i represents the total number of sample schools drawn in stratum i . Given that required schools and volunteer schools were not selected randomly for participation, the base sample weights among these schools was one. That is their probability for selection was one since they were either required to participate or they opted to participate on their own.

School Non-response Weighting Adjustment

There were actually two non-response weighting adjustments that were made to the sample records. The first was an adjustment made at the school level to reflect the fact that all selected schools did not actually participate in the study. This weighting adjustment takes into account schools that refused to participate. The school non-response weighting adjustment is equal to:

$$Adj_{wcti} = \text{School Non-response Weighting Adjustment} = \frac{\sum BW_i}{\sum \delta_{wcti} * BW_i}$$

Where:

- BW_i is the base sample weight in stratum i .
- δ_{wcti} is the school non-response adjustment factor, which is equal to one for schools that participated in the study and zero for schools that did not participate (refused).

The School Non-response Adjusted Weight is then calculated as:

$$BW_{i1} = BW_i * Adj_{wcti}$$

This adjustment was applied to all strata except the volunteer schools. Among the other 4 strata there were a number of schools that chose not to participate. This was true even among the required program schools. The school non-response adjustment apportions the probability of selection to those schools within each stratum that actually participated in the school from all schools in the strata cell. Since volunteer schools are self-selected units, there was no need for this adjustment (the adjustment value was one).

Student Non-response Weighting Adjustments

The first non-response adjustment was made at the sampling strata level, that is, it was applied to all schools within the sampling strata evenly. Again, this adjustment apportioned the probability of selection from all sampled schools to those that actually participated. Within each school, there was also survey non-response. That is, there were students who did not participate in the research by choice, since they were absent, and for other reasons. The student non-response weighting adjustment was made to factor in non-response within each school. The adjustment is equal to:

$$Adj_{rii} = \text{Student Non-response Weighting Adjustment} = \frac{\sum BW_{i1}}{\sum \delta_{rii} * BW_{i1}}$$

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

Where:

- BW_{i1} is the base sample weight in school i after the school non-response adjustment.
- δ_{rii} is the student non-response adjustment factor, which is equal to one for students that participated in the study within each school, and zero for students that did not participate.

The Student Non-response Adjusted Weight is then calculated as:

$$BW_{is} = BW_{i1} * Adj_{rii}$$

After this adjustment, the weighted survey counts within each school sum to the actual population within the school. That is, those students that completed the survey have a positive weight while students that did not participate have an adjusted sample weight of zero. This adjustment was also applied to the volunteer schools.

Post-Stratification Weighting

The goal of weighting the survey data is to allow statements to be made about the target population. But in order to do this, the data set must be representative of the population. Since a survey process involves randomness, it is very unlikely that the survey respondents will exactly match the characteristics of the actual population.

The purpose of post-stratification weighting is to standardize the weights so they sum to the actual population within defined categories. In this research, post-stratification weighting adjustments were made by grade and gender. Given the sampling design and the types of analysis that were conducted, it was necessary to calculate two sets of post-stratification weights: one for analysis of school level data, and one for analysis of data that includes two or more schools (such as analysis at the state level or at the county level).

Data on population counts was developed from a complete list of students provided by the Maine Department of Education. This data provided a breakdown of students by school and within-school by gender and grade. The final weighting numbers were based on the total population of school and students included in the sampling frame.

In both sets of post-stratification weights, the same general process was used. A weighting cell was identified based on the gender and grade. Note that the cells varied across schools given the grades taught at the school. But across all schools, the students were classified into the following cells:

Female	Male
6 th Grade	6 th Grade
7 th Grade	7 th Grade
8 th Grade	8 th Grade
9 th Grade	9 th Grade
10 th Grade	10 th Grade
11 th Grade	11 th Grade
12 th Grade	12 th Grade

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

An adjustment was made to the weight that reflected the total number of students in the population within each of these cells divided by the number of students in each cell that completed the survey. In this fashion, the weighted data reflects the actual distribution of the population by age and gender.

However, this weighting adjustment was only made in cases where there were a minimum of 20 respondents in the cell. This is the minimum level at which weighting can be applied. This meant that in some cases (especially when weighting at the school level) it was not possible to weight within these cells.

Further, there were a number of respondents that did not provide information on their gender and/or grade level. In such cases it was not possible to assign a student to one of these weighting cells. In such cases, their weighting adjustment was always equal to one.

Within-School Post-Stratification Weights

Separate post-stratification weights were developed for within-school analysis and for analysis across schools or analysis that included several schools. The first are the within-school post-stratification weights. The final school post-stratification weight were used for analysis of data at the school level.

This within-school post-stratification weight adjusted the survey data to match the population counts by gender and grade within each school. An adjustment factor was calculated within each school by grade by gender cell:

$$Adj_{ASi} = AS_{\text{school - actual}i} / AS_{\text{school - survey}i}$$

Where:

- Adj_{ASi} is the grade by gender weighting adjustment within each school.
- $AS_{\text{school - actual}i}$ is the actual population within a specific school by grade by gender cell.
- $AS_{\text{school - survey}i}$ is the weighted survey counts within a specific school by grade by gender cell.

The School Post-Stratification Weight was the Student Non-response Adjusted Weight multiplied by this grade/gender weighting adjustment within each school:

$$BW_{\text{sps}} = BW_{\text{is}} * Adj_{ASi}$$

As noted, the weighting adjustment was equal to one in cases where there were fewer than 20 students in a cell.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

Final School Analysis Weight

The final school weight should reflect the total number of students within each school by grade and gender and should be considered representative of the all the students in the school. The weighted counts in the data set should also reflect the actual student counts within the school. There were two factors that influenced weighting at this stage that led to this condition not being met. These are: cases where there were insufficient students in a weighting cell to allow post-stratification weighting, and cases where there was missing data on a respondent for one of the weighting variables. This means that the weighted data set at this point does not reflect the actual count of students within the school in some cases. To account for this, one final adjustment is made to the data set that again standardizes the weights so that they will sum to the actual number of students within the school. It is similar to the post-stratification adjustment noted above but it is applied equally to all students within the school:

$$Adj_{Si} = AS_{actual}/AS_{survey}$$

Where:

- Adj_{Si} was the population standardization weighting adjustment within each school.
- AS_{actual} was the actual population within the school.
- AS_{survey} was the weighted survey counts within the school.

The Final School Analysis Weight is the School Post-Stratification Weight multiplied by this school standardization weighting adjustment within each school:

$$FINSCHWT = BW_{sps} * Adj_{Si}$$

Population Size Reflected in the Final Data Set Using FINSCHWT

The weighted data set is designed to provide data that can be generalized to the population of each participating school. Within each participating school, the results can be generalized to the population of students. In schools with sufficient populations, the results can be generalized to each grade by gender cell (in cases where more than 20 students in the cell completed surveys).

NOTE: Since there are cases where gender and/or grade information was not provided the weighted counts may not equal the actual school population in that specific grade by gender cell (since the data set had to weight all respondents to the actual school population). However, in conducting analysis of survey results within these cells the percentages will accurately reflect the views of the specific subpopulation. That is, the percentages can be generalized to the specific subpopulation (with the caveat that there are sufficient people within the cell).

Geographic Post-Stratification Weights

Separate post-stratification weights were developed for within-school analysis and for analysis across schools or analysis that included several schools. The second are the geographic post-stratification weights. These final geographic post-stratification weights were used for analysis of data at the state and county level or other analysis that includes data from more than one school.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

This geographic post-stratification weight adjusted the survey data to match the population counts by gender and grade within county. An adjustment factor was calculated within each county by grade by gender cell:

$$\text{Adj}_{ACi} = \text{AS}_{\text{county} - \text{actual}} / \text{AS}_{\text{county} - \text{survey}}$$

Where:

- Adj_{ACi} is the grade by gender weighting adjustment within each county.
- $\text{AS}_{\text{county} - \text{actual}}$ is the actual population within a specific county by grade by gender cell (**with caveat noted below**).
- $\text{AS}_{\text{county} - \text{survey}}$ is the weighted survey counts within a specific county by grade by gender cell (**with caveat noted below**).

The Geographic Post-Stratification Weight was the Student Non-response Adjusted Weight multiplied by this grade/gender weighting adjustment within each county:

$$\text{BW}_{\text{cps}} = \text{BW}_{\text{is}} * \text{Adj}_{ACi}$$

CAVEAT:

In the case of post-stratification weights at the county level, only units that were sampled have adjustments. Volunteer schools have a post-stratification weighting adjustment of one. This is done because the students in the volunteer schools represent self-selected units – that is, their probability of selection in the study was one (they were not sampled). In calculations of weights, these students can only represent themselves (actually the total number of students in their respective schools) since they were not part of a sampling process. Only students from the sampled strata have a weighting adjustment not equal to one. These (sampled) students are said to be representative of the broader population in the county weights.

In order to facilitate this, the actual populations within each county were adjusted to remove the populations from the volunteer schools prior to post-stratification weighting. Those students from the sampled strata were then weighted to reflect this population within county.

NOTE: The volunteer schools were included in the weighted data. In analytical terms, they do not add or detract from variance in the broader state or county population but only within their school. When analysis was run, the counts from the sampled schools and the volunteer schools will add up to the total student population in each of the counties.

As noted, the weighting adjustment was equal to one in cases where there were fewer than 20 students in a cell. There were two cells where it was not possible to apply post-stratification weights (out of the 224 total weighting cells). These are sixth graders in Washington county (the two cells are Washington County – 6th Grade – Male; Washington County – 6th Grade – Female). In these cases there were only 4 and 0 respondents respectively among sampled schools. In the cases of Washington County the weighted survey results are representative of the county as a whole. Results are also representative of all weighting cells within the county with the exception of these 2.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

Final Geographic Analysis Weight

The final geographic weight should reflect the total number of students within each county by grade and gender and should be considered representative of the all the students in the county. The weighted counts in the data set should reflect the actual student counts within the county and also in other geographies. There were two factors that influenced weighting at this stage that led to this condition not being met. These are: cases where there were insufficient students in a weighting cell to allow post-stratification weighting (but only in two of the 224 weighting cells), and where there was missing data on a respondent for one of the weighting variables. This means that the weighted data set at this point does not reflect the actual count of students within the county. To account for this, one final adjustment is made to the data set that again standardizes the weights so that they will sum to the actual number of students within the county. It is similar to the post-stratification adjustment noted above but:

- Within sampled students all have the same adjustment within each county.
- Within volunteer students all have the same adjustment within each county.

$$Adj_{Ci} = ACS_{actual}/ACS_{survey}$$

Where:

- Adj_{Ci} was the population standardization weighting adjustment within each county .
- AS_{actual} was the actual population within the county.
- AS_{survey} was the weighted survey counts within the county.

The Final School Analysis Weight is the School Post-Stratification Weight multiplied by this school standardization weighting adjustment within each county:

$$FINALWT = BW_{cps} * Adj_{Ci}$$

Population Size Reflected in the Final Data Set Using FINALWT

The weighted data set is designed to provide data that can be generalized to the population of the state and county. At the state level, the results can be generalized to each grade by gender cell. Within each county, the data can be generalized to each grade by gender cell with the two exceptions noted above (Washington County male/female sixth graders). In these two specific cells, the results can only be said to reflect the views of those responding.

NOTE: Since there are cases where gender and/or grade information was not provided, the weighted counts may not equal the actual county population in that specific grade by gender cell (since the data set had to weight all respondents to the actual county population). However, in conducting analysis of survey results within these cells the percentages will accurately reflect the views of the specific subpopulation. That is, the percentages can be generalized to the specific subpopulation.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

Analysis of the Data Using the Honesty Profile

In weighting the data it was necessary to include all students participating in the survey in the weighting process. The final survey data does include those who did not meet the criteria established under the honesty profile (approximately 4% of respondents). In conducting analysis using the honesty profile filter, the total weighted counts will not sum to the total population since those who met the criteria of the honesty profile represent a sub-segment of the population (although a sub-segment that is nearly all of the population). Given the small number of students not meeting the criteria of the honesty profile, excluding this group from analysis will have a very minimal affect on the results (though in reporting these results, it should be stated that the results are representative of students meeting the criteria for the honesty profile). There are demographic differences when examining those students that did not meet the honesty profile. The most dramatic is the gender differences. While the actual population among all students is a ratio close to 50/50 male and female, the ratio among those not meeting the honesty profile criteria was 72/28 male to female.

H. Comparisons in Methodology of Past MYDAUS Surveys

Earlier versions of the MYDAUS were administered in 1995, 1996, 1998/9, 2000, and 2002. These earlier data provide important comparisons to the 2004 values for the purpose of monitoring any changes in drug use behaviors over time among Maine school students. There have been significant changes in methodology throughout the history of the survey that may have impacted the results (see Table 34).

One of the methodological differences between the survey administrations is related to the sampling of schools. In the 1995 and 1996 administrations, a representative, random sample of schools was selected. In 1998/9, 2000, and 2002, all schools were invited to participate. In these years, a Multi-Phase Stratified Exhaustive Sampling was chosen as the methodology that would most effectively and efficiently allow OSA to achieve its dual goals of: 1) collecting a representative sample stratified by grade or gender at the state, regional and county levels, and 2) providing data for any public school wanting local data for prevention program planning and evaluation. As discussed earlier, the 2004 survey was a mixed sampling, with some schools being required to participate, other schools participating in a randomly-selected sample, and still other schools volunteering to participate on their own.

A second important change in the methodology is related to within-school sampling of students. In the 1995 and 1996 surveys, random samples of students were asked to participate in the survey. In the 1998/9 survey, the total student population was targeted in schools with enrollment figures of 250 or fewer students. Schools with more than 250 students were sampled through a target population that would provide data on an individual school level that would not exceed a ± 5.00 percent margin of error at the 95% confidence interval. In 2000, 2002, and 2004 participating schools were asked to include their entire school population in the survey – regardless of school size. In a few instances, however, a random sample of students participated in the survey as opposed to the entire school population.

APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

The third difference in the methodology concerns the parental consent procedure. The 1995, 1996, 2000, 2002, and 2004 surveys employed a passive consent protocol, in which parents were notified that their children would be surveyed unless they contacted the school and expressed their preference not to have their child participate in the survey. In 1998/9, an active consent protocol was implemented, requiring parents to return a form to the school allowing their children to participate in the survey. The difference in consent protocol may have affected the results of the 1998/9 survey if the parents of high risk students were more or less likely to turn in the form and grant permission for their child to participate. For each administration of the MYDAUS, students were given the option not to participate in the survey. This volunteer sample at the student level may have systematically biased the results; if, for example, students at high risk for drug use chose not to participate in the survey.

Table 34: Comparison of MYDAUS Methodology and Participation: 1995 - 2004.

	Parental Consent	Sampling Strategy	Number of Participating Students	Percent of Eligible Students	Number of Schools	When Administered	Margin of Error
1995	Passive	Random	7,477	7%	48	April to June, 1995	±1.09%
1996	Passive	Random	6,398	6%	55	March to June, 1996	±1.19%
1998/9	Active	Census	22,162	18%	212	October, 1998 to March, 1999	±0.59%
2000	Passive	Census	30,491	27%	180	February, 2000	±0.48%
2002	Passive	Census	56,719	48%	270	February, 2002	±0.30%
2004	Passive	Census/Random	75,165	63%	342	February, 2004	±0.23%

I. Limitations

The MYDAUS is limited due to its exclusive focus on adolescents in school. With such a focus, some adolescent subpopulations, such as school dropouts and homeless and runaway youths, will be missed or undercounted.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

A. Risk and Protective Factor Scales and Cut-Points

The scales for the risk and protective factors were provided by the University of Washington's Social Development Research Group (SDRG). Risk and protective factor scales were constructed using Likert scaling practices. The response options of some items were recoded or reordered to provide a continuum from high to low appropriate for the scale. For risk scale items, a high value reflects an undesirable attitude or behavior. For protective scale items, a high value reflects a desirable attitude or behavior. For the scaled data, the cut point was determined by taking the median value (plus 0.15 times the standard deviation) for each scale for all the weighted 2000 data from all seven participating states in the Diffusion Project consortium. If the individual student's score was above the cut point, s/he was considered at risk (or protected).

By way of illustration, the risk factor in the school domain described as "Lower Academic Achievement" is based on the scores from two questions. One asks, "Putting them all together, what were your grades like last year?" (Question 8). The responses are recoded so that the lowest grades have the highest values; for instance "F" is given the value of 4, "C" is 2.5, and "A" is 1. The second question is, "Are your grades better than the grades of most students in your class?" (Question 18), with the responses ranging from an emphatic "NO!" (4 points) to an emphatic "YES!" (1 point). A student has to answer both questions to get a score for this risk factor. The mean of the two responses is compared to the cut point calculated using the scores from all students in the seven states who answered the two questions. In this case, the cut point for 6th graders is 1.977. If a student scored higher than this, s/he was considered at risk for "Lower Academic Achievement".

B. Risk and Protective Factor Definitions

The following risk and protective factors have been identified through research reviewed by the Social Development Research Group (SDRG), University of Washington, Seattle. SDRG obtained the specific definitions and reasoning listed below from Communities that Care: Action for Drug Abuse Prevention.

Community Climate – Risk Factors

Laws and Norms Favorable to Drugs.

Definition: The degree to which respondents think youth in their neighborhood would be caught by the police if they smoked marijuana, drank alcohol, or carried a handgun and the extent to which they feel parents in the neighborhood would think it's wrong to smoke cigarettes or marijuana or to drink alcohol.

Questions: 93, 95, 96, 102a-c

Reasoning: Research has shown that legal restrictions on alcohol and tobacco use, such as raising the legal drinking age, restricting smoking in public places, and increased taxation have been followed by decreases in consumption. Moreover, national surveys of high school seniors have shown that shifts in normative attitudes toward drug use have preceded changes in prevalence of use.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Perceived Availability of Drugs.

Definition: The degree to which respondents think it is easy for youths to get alcohol, cigarettes, and illicit drugs.

Questions: 87, 88, 94, 98

Reasoning: The availability of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and other illegal drugs has been related to use of these substances by adolescents. Availability of handguns is also related to a higher risk of crime and substance use by adolescents.

Perceived Availability of Handguns.

Definition: The degree to which respondents think it is easy for youths to get handguns.

Questions: 97

Reasoning: The availability of handguns is related to a higher risk of crime and substance use by adolescents.

Family Climate – Risk Factors

Poor Family Management.

Definition: The extent to which respondents report that their parents would catch them if they drank liquor, carried a handgun, or skipped school, as well as the extent to which respondents report that there are clear family rules, that parents know the whereabouts of their children, that there are rules about alcohol and drug use, and that parents monitor homework completion.

Questions: 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 134, 135

Reasoning: Parents' use of inconsistent and/or unusually harsh or severe punishment with their children places them at higher risk for substance use and other problem behaviors. Parents' failure to provide clear expectations and to monitor their children's behavior makes it more likely that they will engage in drug abuse whether or not there are family drug problems.

Family History of Antisocial Behavior.

Definition: Respondents reporting whether they have siblings that drink, smoke marijuana, smoke cigarettes, have been expelled, or have taken a handgun to school; and the number of adults they know who have used and/or dealt drugs, gotten drunk or high, or have engaged in illegal activities.

Questions: 103a-d, 115a-e, 117

Reasoning: When children are raised in a family with a history of problem behaviors (e.g., violence and/or substance use), the children are more likely to engage in these behaviors.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Parental Attitudes Favor Drug Use.

- Definition: The degree to which respondents report their parents would feel it is wrong if they (the respondents) drink liquor, smoke marijuana, or smoke cigarettes.
- Questions: q112a-c
- Reasoning: In families where parents use illegal drugs, are heavy users of alcohol, or are tolerant of children's use, children are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.

Parental Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior.

- Definition: The degree to which respondents report their parents would feel it is wrong if they (the respondents) steal, draw graffiti, or fight.
- Questions: q112d-f
- Reasoning: In families where parents are tolerant of antisocial behavior, children are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.

School Climate – Risk Factors

Lower Academic Achievement.

- Definition: A respondent's grade-based performance.
- Questions: 8, 18
- Reasoning: Beginning in the late elementary grades (grades 4-6), academic failure increases the risk of both drug abuse and delinquency. It appears that the experience of failure itself, for whatever reasons, increases the risk of problem behaviors.

Low School Commitment.

- Definition: The degree to which students find school and homework interesting and important.
- Questions: 9, 20, 21, 22, 23a-c
- Reasoning: Surveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hallucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, sedatives, or non-medically prescribed tranquilizers is significantly lower among students who expect to attend college than among those who do not. Factors such as liking school, spending time on homework, and perceiving the coursework as relevant are also negatively related to drug use.

Peer-Individual Climate – Risk Factors

Rebelliousness.

- Definition: The extent to which respondents report disregarding rules.
- Questions: 30, 33, 47
- Reasoning: Young people who do not feel part of society, are not bound by rules, don't believe in trying to be successful or responsible, or who take an active rebellious stance toward society, are at higher risk of abusing drugs. In addition, high tolerance for deviance, a strong need for independence, and normlessness have all been linked with drug use.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Early Initiation of Drug Use.

Definition: The age at which respondents first try a variety of negative behaviors, including smoking marijuana, drinking alcohol, etc.

Questions: 28a-d

Reasoning: Early onset of drug use predicts misuse of drugs. The earlier the onset of any drug use, the greater the involvement in other drug use and the greater frequency of use. Onset of drug use prior to the age of 15 is a consistent predictor of drug abuse, and a later age of onset of drug use has been shown to predict lower drug involvement and a greater probability of discontinuation of use.

Attitudes Favorable to Antisocial Behavior.

Definition: The extent to which respondents themselves feel that engaging in various anti-social behaviors for youths their age is appropriate.

Questions: 29a-e

Reasoning: Young people who accept or condone antisocial behavior are more likely to engage in a variety of problem behaviors, including drug use.

Attitudes Favorable to Drug Use.

Definition: The extent to which respondents themselves feel that drinking, smoking, or taking illicit drugs for youths their age is appropriate.

Questions: 29f-i

Reasoning: Initiation of use of any substance is preceded by values favorable to its use. During the elementary school years, most children express anti-drug, anti-crime, and pro-social attitudes and have difficulty imagining why people use drugs. However, in middle school, as more youth are exposed to others who use drugs, their attitudes often shift toward greater acceptance of these behaviors. Youth who express positive attitudes toward drug use are at higher risk for subsequent drug use.

Perceived Risk of Drug Use.

Definition: The extent to which respondents themselves feel that people risk harming themselves if they smoke cigarettes, drink or smoke marijuana.

Questions: 52a-d

Reasoning: Young people who do not perceive drug use to be risky are far more likely to engage in drug use.

Antisocial Peers.

Definition: The number of a respondent's friends who engage in anti-social activities.

Questions: 27 h, j, k, m, n, o

Reasoning: Young people who associate with peers who engage in problem behaviors are at higher risk for engaging in antisocial behavior themselves.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Peers' Drugs Use.

- Definition: The number of a respondent's friends who take drugs, drink alcohol and smoke cigarettes.
- Questions: 27 b, c, e, g
- Reasoning: Young people who associate with peers who engage in alcohol or substance abuse are much more likely to engage in the same behavior. Peer drug use has consistently been found to be among the strongest predictors of substance use among youth. Even when young people come from well-managed families and do not experience other risk factors, spending time with friends who use drugs greatly increases the risk of that problem developing.

Sensation Seeking.

- Definition: The extent to which respondents report that they do dangerous and crazy things.
- Questions: 35a-c
- Reasoning: Young people who seek out opportunities for dangerous, risky behavior in general are at higher risk for participating in drug use and other problem behaviors.

Rewards for Antisocial Involvement.

- Definition: The extent to which respondents feel they would be considered cool if they smoked cigarettes, drank, smoked marijuana, or carried a handgun.
- Questions: 39 a, c, e, g
- Reasoning: Young people who receive rewards for their antisocial behavior are at higher risk for engaging further in antisocial behavior and substance use.

Intentions to Use Drugs.

- Definition: The extent to which respondents indicated that they plan to use cigarettes, alcohol, or marijuana as adults.
- Questions: 104a-c
- Reasoning: Intent to use cigarettes, alcohol, and/or marijuana as an adult is a strong predictor of future drug use and antisocial behaviors.

Community Climate – Protective Factors

Community Opportunities for Involvement.

- Definition: Perceived opportunities to engage in pro-social activities in the community and to engage with adults.
- Questions: 106, 109a-e
- Reasoning: When opportunities are available in a community for positive participation, children are less likely to engage in substance use and other problem behaviors.

Community Rewards for Involvement.

- Definition: The degree to which respondents feel people in their neighborhood recognize, acknowledge, and support their positive behaviors.
- Questions: 105, 108, 111
- Reasoning: Rewards for positive participation in activities helps children bond to the community, thus lowering their risk for substance use.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

A. Risk and Protective Factor Scales and Cut-Points

The scales for the risk and protective factors were provided by the University of Washington's Social Development Research Group (SDRG). Risk and protective factor scales were constructed using Likert scaling practices. The response options of some items were recoded or reordered to provide a continuum from high to low appropriate for the scale. For risk scale items, a high value reflects an undesirable attitude or behavior. For protective scale items, a high value reflects a desirable attitude or behavior. For the scaled data, the cut point was determined by taking the median value (plus 0.15 times the standard deviation) for each scale for all the weighted 2000 data from all seven participating states in the Diffusion Project consortium. If the individual student's score was above the cut point, s/he was considered at risk (or protected).

By way of illustration, the risk factor in the school domain described as "Lower Academic Achievement" is based on the scores from two questions. One asks, "Putting them all together, what were your grades like last year?" (Question 8). The responses are recoded so that the lowest grades have the highest values; for instance "F" is given the value of 4, "C" is 2.5, and "A" is 1. The second question is, "Are your grades better than the grades of most students in your class?" (Question 18), with the responses ranging from an emphatic "NO!" (4 points) to an emphatic "YES!" (1 point). A student has to answer both questions to get a score for this risk factor. The mean of the two responses is compared to the cut point calculated using the scores from all students in the seven states who answered the two questions. In this case, the cut point for 6th graders is 1.977. If a student scored higher than this, s/he was considered at risk for "Lower Academic Achievement".

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

B. Risk and Protective Factor Definitions

The following risk and protective factors have been identified through research reviewed by the Social Development Research Group (SDRG), University of Washington, Seattle:

Community Climate – Risk Factors

Laws and Norms Favorable to Drugs

- Definition:** The degree to which respondents think youth in their neighborhood would be caught by the police if they smoked marijuana, drank alcohol, or carried a handgun and the extent to which they feel parents in the neighborhood would think it's wrong to smoke cigarettes or marijuana or to drink alcohol.
- Questions:** Q93: *If a kid smoked marijuana in your neighborhood, would he or she be caught by the police?*
Q95: *If a kid drank some beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin) in your neighborhood, would he or she be caught by the police?*
Q96: *If a kid carried a handgun without permission in your neighborhood would he or she be caught by the police?*
Q102a-c: *How wrong would most adults (over 21) in your neighborhood think it is for kids your age: to use marijuana? to drink alcohol? to smoke cigarettes?*
- Reasoning:** Research has shown that legal restrictions on alcohol and tobacco use, such as raising the legal drinking age, restricting smoking in public places, and increased taxation have been followed by decreases in consumption. Moreover, national surveys of high school seniors have shown that shifts in normative attitudes toward drug use have preceded changes in prevalence of use.

Perceived Availability of Drugs

- Definition:** The degree to which respondents think it is easy for youths to get alcohol, cigarettes, and illicit drugs.
- Questions:** Q87: *If you wanted to get some beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin), how easy would it be for you to get some?*
Q88: *If you wanted to get some cigarettes, how easy would it be for you to get some?*
Q94: *If you wanted to get a drug like cocaine, LSD, or amphetamines, how easy would it be for you to get some?*
Q98: *If you wanted to get some marijuana, how easy would it be for you to get some?*
- Reasoning:** The availability of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and other illegal drugs has been related to use of these substances by adolescents. Availability of handguns is also related to a higher risk of crime and substance use by adolescents.

Perceived Availability of Handguns

- Definition:** The degree to which respondents think it is easy for youths to get handguns.
- Questions:** Q97: *If you wanted to get a handgun without permission, how easy would it be for you to get one?*
- Reasoning:** The availability of handguns is related to a higher risk of crime and substance use by adolescents.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Family Climate – Risk Factors

Poor Family Management

- Definition: The extent to which respondents report that their parents would catch them if they drank liquor, carried a handgun, or skipped school, as well as the extent to which respondents report that there are clear family rules, that parents know the whereabouts of their children, that there are rules about alcohol and drug use, and that parents monitor homework completion.
- Questions: Q116: *The rules in my family are clear.*
Q118: *When I am not at home, one of my parents knows where I am and whom I am with.*
Q119: *If you drank some beer, wine or liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin) without your parents' permission, would you be caught by your parents?*
Q120: *My family has clear rules about alcohol and drug use.*
Q121: *If you carried a handgun without your parents' permission, would you be caught by your parents?*
Q122: *If you skipped school, would you be caught by your parents?*
Q134: *My parents ask if I've gotten my homework done.*
Q135: *Would your parents know if you did not come home on time?*
- Reasoning: Parents' use of inconsistent and/or unusually harsh or severe punishment with their children places them at higher risk for substance use and other problem behaviors. Parents' failure to provide clear expectations and to monitor their children's behavior makes it more likely that they will engage in drug abuse whether or not there are family drug problems.

Family History of Antisocial Behavior

- Definition: Respondents reporting whether they have siblings that drink, smoke marijuana, smoke cigarettes, have been expelled, or have taken a handgun to school; and the number of adults they know who have used and/or dealt drugs, gotten drunk or high, or have engaged in illegal activities.
- Questions: Q103a-d: *About how many adults (over 21) have you known personally who in the past year have: used marijuana, crack, cocaine, or other drugs? sold or dealt drugs? done other things that could get them in trouble with the police like stealing, selling stolen goods, mugging or assaulting others, etc.? gotten drunk or high?*
Q115a-e: *Have any of your brothers or sisters ever: drunk beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin)? smoked marijuana? smoked cigarettes? taken a handgun to school without permission? been suspended or expelled from school?*
Q117: *Has anyone in your family ever had a severe alcohol or drug problem?*
- Reasoning: When children are raised in a family with a history of problem behaviors (e.g., violence and/or substance use), the children are more likely to engage in these behaviors.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Parental Attitudes Favor Drug Use

- Definition: The degree to which respondents report their parents would feel it is wrong if they (the respondents) drink liquor, smoke marijuana, or smoke cigarettes.
- Questions: Q112a-c: *How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to: drink beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin) regularly? smoke cigarettes? smoke marijuana?*
- Reasoning: In families where parents use illegal drugs, are heavy users of alcohol, or are tolerant of children's use, children are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.

Parental Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior

- Definition: The degree to which respondents report their parents would feel it is wrong if they (the respondents) steal, draw graffiti, or fight.
- Questions: Q112d-f: *How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to: steal something worth more than \$5? draw graffiti, or write things or draw pictures on buildings or other property (without the owner's permission)? pick a fight with someone?*
- Reasoning: In families where parents are tolerant of antisocial behavior, children are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.

School Climate – Risk Factors

Lower Academic Achievement

- Definition: A respondent's grade-based performance.
- Questions: Q8: *Putting them all together, what were your grades like last year?*
Q18: *Are your school grades better than the grades of most students in your class?*
- Reasoning: Beginning in the late elementary grades (grades 4-6), academic failure increases the risk of both drug abuse and delinquency. It appears that the experience of failure itself, for whatever reasons, increases the risk of problem behaviors.

Low Commitment to School

- Definition: The degree to which students find school and homework interesting and important.
- Questions: Q9: *During the last four weeks how many whole days of school have you missed because you skipped or "cut"?*
Q20: *How often do you feel that the schoolwork you are assigned is meaningful and important?*
Q21: *How interesting are most of your courses to you?*
Q22: *How important do you think the things you are learning in school are going to be for your later life?*
Q23a-c: *Now thinking over the past year in school, how often did you: enjoy being in school? hate being in school? try to do your best work in school?*
- Reasoning: Surveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hallucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, sedatives, or non-medically prescribed tranquilizers is significantly lower among students who expect to attend college than among those who do not. Factors such as liking school, spending time on homework, and perceiving the coursework as relevant are also negatively related to drug use.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Peer-Individual Climate – Risk Factors

Rebelliousness

Definition: The extent to which respondents report disregarding rules.

Questions: Q30: *I ignore rules that get in my way.*
Q33: *I do the opposite of what people tell me, just to get them mad.*
Q47: *I like to see how much I can get away with.*

Reasoning: Young people who do not feel part of society, are not bound by rules, don't believe in trying to be successful or responsible, or who take an active rebellious stance toward society, are at higher risk of abusing drugs. In addition, high tolerance for deviance, a strong need for independence, and normlessness have all been linked with drug use.

Early Initiation of Drug Use

Definition: The age at which respondents first try a variety of negative behaviors, including smoking marijuana, drinking alcohol, etc.

Questions: Q28a-d: *How old were you when you first: smoked marijuana? smoked a cigarette, even just a puff? had more than a sip or two of beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin)? began drinking alcoholic beverages regularly, that is, at least once or twice a month?*

Reasoning: Early onset of drug use predicts misuse of drugs. The earlier the onset of any drug use, the greater the involvement in other drug use and the greater frequency of use. Onset of drug use prior to the age of 15 is a consistent predictor of drug abuse, and a later age of onset of drug use has been shown to predict lower drug involvement and a greater probability of discontinuation of use.

Attitudes Favorable to Antisocial Behavior

Definition: The extent to which respondents themselves feel that engaging in various anti-social behaviors for youths their age is appropriate.

Questions: Q29a-e: *How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to: take a handgun to school without permission? steal anything worth more than \$5? pick a fight with someone? attack someone with the idea of seriously hurting them? stay away from school all day when their parents think they are at school?*

Reasoning: Young people who accept or condone antisocial behavior are more likely to engage in a variety of problem behaviors, including drug use.

Attitudes Favorable to Drug Use

Definition: The extent to which respondents themselves feel that drinking, smoking, or taking illicit drugs for youths their age is appropriate.

Questions: Q29f-i: *How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to: drink beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin) regularly? smoke cigarettes? smoke marijuana? use LSD, cocaine, amphetamines or another illegal drug?*

Reasoning: Initiation of use of any substance is preceded by values favorable to its use. During the elementary school years, most children express anti-drug, anti-crime, and pro-social attitudes and have difficulty imagining why people use drugs. However, in middle school, as more youth are exposed to others who use drugs, their attitudes often shift toward greater acceptance of these behaviors. Youth who express positive attitudes toward drug use are at higher risk for subsequent drug use.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Perceived Risk of Drug Use.

- Definition: The extent to which respondents themselves feel that people risk harming themselves if they smoke cigarettes, drink or smoke marijuana.
- Questions: Q52a-d: *How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they: smoke one or more packs of cigarettes per day? try marijuana once or twice? smoke marijuana regularly? take one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage (beer, wine, or hard liquor) nearly every day?*
- Reasoning: Young people who do not perceive drug use to be risky are far more likely to engage in drug use.

Interaction with Antisocial Peers

- Definition: The number of a respondent's friends who engage in anti-social activities.
- Questions: Q27h,j,k,m,n,o: *Think of your four best friends. How many in the past year have: been suspended from school? carried a handgun without permission? sold illegal drugs? stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle such as a car or motorcycle? been arrested? dropped out of school?*
- Reasoning: Young people who associate with peers who engage in problem behaviors are at higher risk for engaging in antisocial behavior themselves.

Peers' Drugs Use

- Definition: The number of a respondent's friends who take drugs, drink alcohol and smoke cigarettes.
- Questions: Q27 b, c, e, g: *Think of your four best friends. How many in the past year have: smoked cigarettes? tried beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin) when their parents didn't know about it? used marijuana? used LSD, cocaine, amphetamines, or other illegal drugs?*
- Reasoning: Young people who associate with peers who engage in alcohol or substance abuse are much more likely to engage in the same behavior. Peer drug use has consistently been found to be among the strongest predictors of substance use among youth. Even when young people come from well-managed families and do not experience other risk factors, spending time with friends who use drugs greatly increases the risk of that problem developing.

Sensation Seeking

- Definition: The extent to which respondents report that they do dangerous and crazy things.
- Questions: Q35a-c: *How many times have you done the following things: Done crazy things even if they are a little dangerous? Done something dangerous because someone dared you to do it? Done what feels good no matter what?*
- Reasoning: Young people who seek out opportunities for dangerous, risky behavior in general are at higher risk for participating in drug use and other problem behaviors.

Rewards for Antisocial Involvement

- Definition: The extent to which respondents feel they would be considered cool if they smoked cigarettes, drank, smoked marijuana, or carried a handgun.
- Questions: Q39 a, c, e, g: *What are the chances you would be seen as cool if you: smoked cigarettes? began drinking alcoholic beverages regularly, that is, at least once or twice a month? smoked marijuana? carried a handgun without permission?*
- Reasoning: Young people who receive rewards for their antisocial behavior are at higher risk for engaging further in antisocial behavior and substance use.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Intentions to Use Drugs

- Definition: The extent to which respondents indicated that they plan to use cigarettes, alcohol, or marijuana as adults.
- Questions: Q104a-c: *Sometimes we don't know what we will do as adults, but we may have an idea. Please answer how true these statements may be for you. When I am an adult: I will smoke cigarettes. I will drink beer, wine, or liquor. I will smoke marijuana.*
- Reasoning: Intent to use cigarettes, alcohol, and/or marijuana as an adult is a strong predictor of future drug use and antisocial behaviors.

Community Climate – Protective Factors

Community Opportunities for Involvement

- Definition: Perceived opportunities to engage in pro-social activities in the community and to engage with adults.
- Questions: Q106: *There are lots of adults in my neighborhood I could talk to about something important.*
Q109a-e: *Which of the following activities for people your age are available in your community: sports teams? scouting? boys and girls clubs? 4-H clubs? service clubs?*
- Reasoning: When opportunities are available in a community for positive participation, children are less likely to engage in substance use and other problem behaviors.

Community Rewards for Involvement

- Definition: The degree to which respondents feel people in their neighborhood recognize, acknowledge, and support their positive behaviors.
- Questions: Q105: *My neighbors notice when I am doing a good job and let me know about it.*
Q108: *There are people in my neighborhood who are proud of me when I do something well.*
Q111: *There are people in my neighborhood who encourage me to do my best.*
- Reasoning: Rewards for positive participation in activities helps children bond to the community, thus lowering their risk for substance use.

Family Climate – Protective Factors

Family Attachment

- Definition: The extent to which respondents feel close to and can share openly with their mother and father.
- Questions: Q124: *Do you feel very close to your mother?*
Q125: *Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your mother?*
Q128: *Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your father?*
Q132: *Do you feel very close to your father?*
- Reasoning: Young people who feel that they are a valued part of their family are less likely to engage in substance use and other problem behaviors.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

Family Opportunities for Pro-social Involvement

- Definition: The extent to which respondents participate in family decision making, have opportunities to do fun things with their parents, and can share problems with their parents.
- Questions: Q126: *My parents ask me what I think before most family decisions affecting me are made.*
Q131: *If I had a personal problem, I could ask my mom or dad for help.*
Q133: *My parents give me lots of chances to do fun things with them.*
- Reasoning: Young people who are exposed to more opportunities to participate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.

Family Rewards for Pro-social Involvement

- Definition: The extent to which respondents report their parents acknowledging and praising them for good things they do, and that they enjoy spending time with their parents.
- Questions: Q123: *My parents notice when I am doing a good job and let me know about it.*
Q127: *How often do your parents tell you they're proud of you for something you've done?*
Q129: *Do you enjoy spending time with your mother?*
Q130: *Do you enjoy spending time with your father?*
- Reasoning: When parents, siblings, and other family members praise, encourage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.

School Climate – Protective Factors

School Opportunities for Pro-social Involvement

- Definition: The degree to which respondents feel that they can interact with teachers and can participate in school-related activities.
- Questions: Q10: *In my school, students have lots of chances to help decide things like class activities and rules.*
Q11: *Teachers ask me to work on special classroom projects.*
Q13: *There are lots of chances for students in my school to get involved in sports, clubs, and other school activities outside of class.*
Q14: *There are lots of chances for students in my school to talk with a teacher one-on-one.*
Q19: *There are lots of chances to be part of class discussions or activities.*
- Reasoning: When young people are given more opportunities to participate meaningfully in important activities at school, they are less likely to engage in drug use problem behaviors.

APPENDIX B – RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTOR DEFINITIONS

School Rewards for Pro-social Involvement

- Definition: The degree to which respondents feel acknowledged by teachers and their parents relative to their (the students) school involvement and performance.
- Questions: Q12: *My teacher(s) notices when I am doing a good job and lets me know about it.*
Q15: *I feel safe at my school.*
Q16: *The school lets my parents know when I have done something well.*
Q17: *My teachers praise me when I work hard in school.*
- Reasoning: When young people are recognized and rewarded for their contributions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance use and other problem behaviors.

Peer-Individual Climate – Protective Factors

Social Skills

- Definition: Scenarios that require the respondent to make a decision about the best, or most pro-social option.
- Questions: Q40: *You're looking at CDs in a music store with a friend. You look up and see her slip a CD under her coat. She smiles and says "which one do you want? Go ahead, take it while nobody's around." There is nobody in sight, no employees and no other customers. What would you do now?*
Q41: *It's 8:00 on a weeknight and you are about to go over to a friend's home when your mother asks you where you are going. You say, "Oh, just going to go hang out with some friends." She says, "No, you'll just get into trouble if you go out. Stay home tonight." What would you do now?*
Q42: *You are visiting another part of town, and you don't know any of the people your age there. You are walking down the street, and some teenager you don't know is walking toward you. He is about your size, and as he is about to pass you, he deliberately bumps into you and you almost lose your balance. What would you say or do?*
Q43: *You are at a party at someone's house, and one of your friends offers you a drink containing alcohol. What would you say or do?*
- Reasoning: Young people who are socially competent and engage in positive interpersonal relations with their peers are less likely to use drugs and engage in other problem behaviors.

Belief in the Moral Order

- Definition: The degree to which respondents feel it is OK to fight, steal, cheat and be dishonest.
- Questions: Q31: *It is all right to beat up people if they start the fight.*
Q32: *It is important to be honest with your parents, even if they become upset or you get punished.*
Q34: *I think it is okay to take something without asking if you can get away with it.*
Q46: *I think sometimes it's okay to cheat at school.*
- Reasoning: Young people who have a belief in what is "right" or "wrong" are less likely to use drugs.
-